

# The American Church Monthly

August, 1917

20 Cents

**That He May Dwell in Us**

*The Rev. William H. A. Hall* - - - 1

**Educated Men and the Christian Religion**

*The Rev. Selden P. Delany, D.D.* - - - 2

**The Beginning of Church Architecture in America**

*The Rev. Walker Gwynne, D.D.* - - - 12

**Drink Reform and the Example of Christ**

*The Rev. Wilson E. Tanner* - - - 25

**The Proposed Rubric Concerning Reservation**

*The Rev. John Cole McKim* - - - 34

**Selected — Expressions of the Communion of Saints—**

Recollections of Father Stanton—With Christ—

Luther and Freedom of Thought - - - 43

**The Church at Work—The Deaconess in City Missions—**

Notes on the Work of a Prison Chaplain - - - 53

**Communication—German "Liberal Protestantism" and  
Frightfulness**

*The Rev. Edwin Selden Lane* - - - 58

**Editorial Comment** - - - - - 65

**Book Reviews** - - - - - 72

# THE EUCHARISTIC OFFERING

Spiritual instructions upon the Office of Holy Communion, together with helps for carrying out of the same. Including a Kalendar for the Commemoration of Persons and Events. A method of Eucharistic Preparation, Intercession and Thanksgiving. The Office analyzed, annotated and accompanied with Devotions adapted to its several parts. An arrangement of Collects, Epistles and Gospels whereby the Eucharistic Thought proper for the day is made plain.

BY

The Rt. Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE, S. T. D., Bishop of Edinburgh, Scotland  
Sometime Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the General Theological Seminary, New York  
With introduction by the late Rev. Morgan Dix, S. T. D., D. C. L.

Bound in Cloth, Red Edges. Price, 75 cents. If sent by mail, 80 cents

R. W. CROTHERS

Nineteenth Street and Irving Place, New York City

## CHURCH VESTMENTS AND EMBROIDERIES

Miss Alice Veader, 32 Highland Street, New Haven, Conn., will fill orders for Church Vestments and Embroideries of all kinds. Miss Veader finds it possible to execute her work for very moderate prices, though she uses the best materials and aims at the highest workmanship. She also lays to heart the admonition of George Herbert of blessed memory, "No light colors or foolish anticks."

SAMPLES, DESIGNS AND ESTIMATES  
ON APPLICATION

## ST. STEPHEN'S COLLEGE

*Annandale-on-Hudson, N. Y.*

A Church College offering a thorough education leading to the degrees of B.A. or Ph.B. Special advantages for students intending to study for Holy Orders. Charges for Tuition, Room, Board, Heat and Light, only \$425 a year. For catalogue and fuller information, apply to

THE REV. PRESIDENT RODGERS.

PUBLICATIONS by the late The Rev. H. PAGE DYER are now for sale by the  
Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament  
14 East 109th St., New York

## Cathedral Studio

Supplies every kind of

### CHURCH EMBROIDERY

Specialties: English Silk Stoles, Hand-some Crosses, \$5.50; Plain, \$3.50; Hand-some Gift Stoles, \$10 upward.

MISS MACKRILLE

11 W. Kirke St., Chevy Chase, Washington, D. C.

ECCLIASTICAL and DOMESTIC ART  
WORKER, MEMORIAL WINDOWS,  
LEADED GLASS, MONUMENTS, ME-  
MORIAL TABLETS, CHURCH FURNISHINGS.

Write CHARLES F. HOGEMAN

45 SEVENTH AVE.

NEW YORK CITY

## The American Church Monthly

is for sale at the following places:

### NEW YORK:

E. S. Gorham, 9 and 11 West 45th St.  
R. W. Crothers, 122 East 19th St.  
Church Literature Press, 2 Bible House  
Sunday School Commission, 73 Fifth Ave.  
Brentano's, Fifth Ave. and 27th St.

### BALTIMORE:

Lycett's, 317 North Charles St.

### BOSTON:

Old Corner Bookstore, 27 and 29 Brom-field St.

### CHICAGO:

A. C. McClurg & Co., 218 South Wabash Ave.

### PHILADELPHIA:

George W. Jacobs & Co., 1628 Chest-nut St.

### ROCHESTER, N. Y.:

Scranton, Wetmore & Co.

### MILWAUKEE:

The Young Churchman Co., 484 Milwau-kee St.

### WASHINGTON:

Woodward & Lathrop, Inc.

# The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing  
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion  
and more especially the Church in the United States*

---

Volume I

AUGUST, 1917

Number 6

---

## “That He May Dwell in Us”

“He that eateth My Flesh, and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him.”

WHEN Peter saw, upon the mountain height,  
The Lord, in glistening robe, and with Him twain  
Who lived long time before, he there was fain  
To build three tabernacles, frail and slight,  
To house the saints, and hide from him the sight  
Of glory. 'Twas to him unknown how vain  
And futile were the effort to restrain  
In man-built tent the Lord of Life and Light.

May I a temple for eternity  
Provide for Thee? Thou com'st to me unseen  
By eyes material; but, through the light  
Of faith, I know Thou givest me the might  
To house forever, though unworthy e'en,  
Thy Body, Soul, and Thy Divinity.

*William H. A. Hall.*

## Educated Men and the Christian Religion

THE assertion is often made that many of the most gifted men of our time, the most highly educated, and the leaders in the business and professional world, are not actively interested in any form of orthodox Christianity. This assertion cannot be challenged. Indeed it is a truism. It is doubtful, however, whether this statement is any more true of the educated classes than of all the other classes in our population. It would be easy to find men in all strata of society who are out of sympathy with Christianity. May we go so far as to say that the majority of the educated men in the United States refuse to profess the Christian creed? That would certainly be a hazardous statement to make. For it is undeniable that many of the leading citizens of this country are prominently identified with one or another group of Christian believers. One could name many lawyers and journalists and physicians and college professors, as well as many of the chief figures in the financial world, who have ardently enlisted in the cause of Christianity. As to whether they are more or less numerous than the men of equal prominence who are not affiliated with any form of Christian belief, it would be difficult to say.

For the purpose of this discussion let us make the admission that the majority of the educated men in the United States are not to be found in church on Sunday morning. That is certainly true of a sufficiently large number of them to be disquieting to all earnest Christians. The majority of the men for example, whom one would meet at the Harvard, Yale, or Princeton Clubs, or at the University Club, in New York City, would probably belong to this class. The question we are first to consider is, how are we to account for it? Having tried to answer that question, the further question will occur to those of us who are deeply interested in the religion of Christ, what kind of an appeal ought we to make to these men?

## I

First then, what is the explanation of the fact that many of our most highly educated men are not professed followers of Christ? One explanation, often advanced by liberal ecclesiastics, is that the modern mind cannot accept the doctrines of orthodox Christianity, particularly the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement. The Rev. Dr. S. D. McConnell gives this as his explanation in a brilliant article in *The North American Review* for March, entitled "What Should the Churches Do?" He holds that there is "too much blood" in the traditional presentation of Christianity to make it acceptable to the modern mind. He means there is too much preaching of the Cross. One cannot but wonder where he has been going to church. Nevertheless Dr. McConnell does not seem to be altogether clear in his own mind what is to be done to attract the modern mind. He admits that the so-called liberal creeds of the day, which have discarded all the traditional dogmas of historical Christianity, do not attract modern men, whether learned or unlearned, in any large numbers. He is perplexed by the fact that the Catholic Mass and Mr. Sunday, whom he calls the "mountebank evangelist," with his very antiquated theology, both make a tremendous appeal. The modern man, when he does feel the need of religion, as for example when he is dying on the battlefield, seems to want a religion that touches his emotions and quiets his fears of the unknown future; he craves the assurance of a personal Saviour rather than an up-to-date creed that satisfies his intellect. The remedy tentatively suggested by Dr. McConnell is that all the old religious dogmas should be left undisturbed by the various religious bodies, but that nobody should be required to accept them. He would have these religious bodies admit all earnest and thoughtful men into full membership, if they are sincerely trying to live the Christian life, whether they believe anything or not.

Dr. McConnell, for all his intellectual acumen, does not seem to have penetrated to the root of the difficulty. The real explanation is to be sought on another plane than that of the intellect. It is not the ancient and traditional dogmas that have

formed the barrier between educated men and the Christian religion. That is sufficiently proven by the fact, as Dr. McConnell is forced to admit, that the liberal religions of the day, such as Unitarianism and the Society for Ethical Culture, do not make any considerable appeal to the thinkers and leaders of our time. Probably very few intelligent men would mention the intellectual difficulty as their reason for holding themselves aloof from the ranks of professing Christians.

What then do these educated men themselves state as the reason why they are not actively interested in the Christian religion? It would be difficult to get from any of them a definite, categorical answer. Very few of them are violently antagonistic to the principles of Christianity. They believe for the most part that the Christian religion is a good thing for people in general. They quite approve of their wives going to church; and they are willing and often eager to send their children to the Sunday School. In many cases they contribute materially to the support of some Christian place of worship in their neighborhood. As for themselves, however, they prefer to devote their Sundays to golf, tennis, or yachting, during the summer months; and to skating, skeeing, coasting, or walking, during the colder months. Occasionally they occupy themselves with cultivating a garden; and while their families are at church they are exercising vigorously with spade and hoe until the sweat streams down their faces.

Most of these men would insist that they were interested in the cause of Christianity, and that they would wish to do all in their power to help make it prosper. Moreover, many of them would maintain that they are good Christians, and that the mere matter of going to church is not of vital importance; and that it does not make any difference how you worship God or what you believe, as long as you are trying to live decently as a loyal citizen and patriot. If you ask them whether they did not think it would be stimulating to them and a help to the cause of Christianity if they took part in the worship of God with their fellow-Christians at least every Sunday morning, they might admit that it would; but they would tell you that they had found it necessary in order to preserve the best of health to

spend as much time as possible in the open air. They would explain that the rush of business made great demands upon them during the week, and therefore they felt that on Saturdays and Sundays they must return to the conditions of primitive man in so far as they could.

If you pressed them still further, they would perhaps declare that their main excuse for not going to church was that the local clergyman did not appeal to them. In their opinion he was a small man; he was a conceited man and always insisted on talking about himself and his own affairs; his sermons were mediocre and failed to give them any stimulus toward a higher life; he also rendered the service in an unacceptable manner. In fact, they would end by saying, "there must be something the matter with religion; the best men no longer went into the ministry; and the churches seemed to be failing more and more to accomplish their real purpose."

Now of course there is something back of all this, that does that does not find expression in these excuses. An intelligent man, if he really believed in the Christian religion, would put spiritual interests first in his life. He would be in his place in church on Sunday morning, in summer as well as in winter. He would be a man of prayer. He would be actively interested in the extension of the Kingdom of God, not only in his own immediate neighborhood, but throughout the world. He would contrive somehow, in spite of the time and energy he expended in religious worship, to secure as much exercise as his health demanded, although he might not think it necessary to pose as an athlete until the day of his death. He would be loyal to the fellowship of the faithful as to the Body of Christ, regardless of the personality of the clergyman who happened to be in charge of the congregation to which he belonged. It is a foolish and false sacerdotalism, unfortunately all too common in these days, to exalt the personality of the clergyman out of all proportion to its importance. Earnest and devout Christians believe in and practice their religion, not because they like the clergyman, but because they believe in Christ and wish to live in spiritual relationship with Him.

Back of these superficial excuses, advanced no doubt in perfectly good faith, we shall find the real reason why so many of the leading men in the professional and business world are not interested in the Christian religion. The reason is that they do not understand what religion is about. The language of religion means little or nothing to them. If you talk to them about religion, you must talk to them as if they were very young children. They ask the same kind of questions that children ask. They scarcely know the alphabet of religion. This abysmal ignorance concerning one of the supreme interests of humanity is not surprising. We often find in some of our ablest men the same sort of incapacity to understand philosophy, or music, or painting. They are strangers to these interests, not because they object to the idealist philosophy or the pragmatist philosophy; not because they consider Wagnerian music grotesque; not because they disapprove of the ideals of the most modern school of painting; but only because they do not understand the first elements of philosophy or music or painting. It may also happen that a painter does not understand business, nor law, nor even religion; and that a theologian does not understand painting. The clergy are notoriously guileless and simple when they embark upon a career of speculation in the stock market. The human intelligence is unfortunately very limited in scope. When a man becomes absorbed in one group of human activities, he easily becomes oblivious of all other groups.

Religion then is an unexplored region of experience to many of the keenest intellects of our modern world. They have allowed materialistic and temporal interests to crowd out of their lives the interests that are spiritual and eternal. It is not merely the difficulty of not being able to understand the language of religion. If it were, the condition might be remedied by filling the land with imitators of Mr. William Sunday. He talks about religion in the language of the race-track, the baseball diamond, the gambling-table, and the stock market; and men readily understand him. The difficulty lies deeper than that. Multitudes of modern men are simply incapable of entering seriously into any religious experience, because their spiritual faculties have either never been used or have remained unused

for a very long time. It is a well known physiological fact that the bodily organs become atrophied from lack of exercise. The same principle holds true of all the powers of life, intellectual and spiritual; they become enervated unless constantly employed.

## II

What then are we, the representatives of the Christian religion, going to do about it? What kind of an appeal are we to make to these high-principled, well-intentioned modern men who appear to take so little interest in Christianity?

Might it not be well in the first place to point out to them that their attitude is one of self-centered individualism? They say they believe in doing the best they are able, each man by himself. They profess to believe in God and in the main principles of Christian morality; and they live as nearly in accordance with that belief as they can, each in an isolated way. They are fond of saying that it is none of their business how the man next door lives or what he believes; and they wish he would not concern himself unduly with their affairs. If each man would do the best he could, according to his light and opportunity, the world would be a better place to live in.

Now the chief criticism to be brought against this attitude of mind is that it is a strange position for an intelligent man to take at this stage of the world's history. It is hopelessly out of date, mid-Victorian in fact. The whole trend of development in this age is toward co-operation and away from individualism. Whenever a man of our day undertakes anything of importance he associates himself with a number of other people who are trying to do the same thing. He forms a club or a society or an organization of some sort; or he enters one already formed. A business man, for example, feels that he needs regular daily exercise to keep himself in the best of health. He does not go to the gymnasium day after day and swing dumb-bells and pull chest weights in splendid isolation; he joins a class or forms a club with other business men and they meet at the same hour and practice their exercises together. Or a philanthropist desires to ameliorate the condition of the destitute in a great city. Unless he is a fool he does not go about it alone, in his

own self-chosen way; he associates himself with others who are banded together for the same beneficent purposes. A special task is assigned to each person, the territory is divided, and overlapping and duplication are prevented.

Why should not the same principle be followed by all who are trying to live the Christian life? Is it not plain, practical common sense that when anyone undertakes to conduct his affairs according to Christian ideals, he should associate himself with other men who are trying to do the same thing? Even for the best of us it is no simple matter to live the Christian life. It is not easy to keep God constantly in mind, to be true to the highest ideals, to maintain a perpetual struggle against temptation, to develop the praying faculties, and to worship God in spirit and in truth. Why handicap ourselves by trying to do it alone? To co-operate with others will be a tremendous help, to them and to us. We all know the stimulus and encouragement that come to us when we join with a large and enthusiastic congregation in the worship of God. What is true of worship is true of everything else that has to do with Christian living. If we are associated with others, whether a hundred or a thousand, who are endeavoring to practice self-denial and humility and charity, we derive strength and encouragement from the sympathy and efforts of our fellowmen. We hear a good deal these days about the dangers of contagion. Let us not forget that there is a contagion of good influences as well as of evil; and let us not despise the vast contagious power of human sympathy and fellowship.

Must we all then get together and form a religious association for mutual sympathy and co-operation? Fortunately there is no necessity for advocating anything like that. We are not compelled to organize a church. The Church is already here. It was here before we were born; it was here before our fathers were born; it was strong and flourishing in the world before there was a white man in America; it has been in the world for nineteen centuries.

How did the Church happen to be in the world? Did it owe its origin to the fact that nineteen centuries ago a certain number of people who were trying to live the Christian life came

together and formed a religious organization? One who is innocent of any knowledge of history might naturally suppose that this was the way the Church came into existence. He would be mistaken. The Church did not come from man; it came from God. Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God, founded the Church, to carry on His redemptive work and extend His influence throughout the world. St. Paul spoke of the Church as the Body of Christ, of which all the baptized were the members. It would be difficult to find a better definition of the Church than that given by a recent English writer:\*

“The Church is a Divine self-organizing Society, of which Jesus Christ is the Head, knit together by a common Faith and Sacraments, whose aim is the spiritual education of mankind in the spirit and faith of Christ.”

In making our appeal, however, it would be well not to lay too much stress on the supernatural powers God has entrusted to the Church nor on the revealed truth He has commissioned the Church to teach men. “Spiritual things are spiritually discerned,” and the modern men to whom we are appealing may not yet be in a position to appreciate this side of the Church’s claim. We must try rather to commend the Church to them simply on human and natural grounds. We must try to make them see that from the point of view of twentieth century common sense the wisest course for any man who believes in Christian ideals is to throw in his lot with other men and women who believe in those ideals; and to make the best use he can of that body of believers which is of Divine institution and already has nineteen centuries of achievement behind it.

At this point the intelligent modern man, whose case we are considering, might quite reasonably feel called upon to say something in reply. He might conceivably express his sentiments somewhat as follows: “Well, all that sounds reasonable enough; but the trouble is that it is very difficult to find the Christian Church. Granted that God founded a Church on earth nineteen centuries ago, how is one to know where this Church is

---

\* J. M. Wilson, quoted in “Conscience: Its Origin and Authority” by G. L. Richardson. London, 1915. p. 141.

to-day? On looking around we do not find this one Divine organism of which you speak; we find instead a hundred or more different organizations calling themselves churches. To me it seems practically a hopeless task to find the true Church, as things are to-day. But if all you Christians will unite and form one church, why then I will admit that your appeal is very reasonable, and that I ought to belong to that church. Therefore under the present conditions I feel that the best thing for me is to go on as I am, trying to live the Christian life without belonging to any church."

Superficially considered, this reply sounds rather plausible. And yet this is not the principle on which the modern man acts in other matters. Take for example the man who is ill. He suddenly discovers that something is organically wrong with his heart. He knows perfectly well there are hundreds of doctors in the city to whom he might go; he would probably find various cures for his particular disease advertised in the daily papers; he realizes that there are many places to which he could go to have that particular disease treated. Does he simply throw up his hands and say, "Oh, well, what's the use? Here are hundreds of different people who profess to be able to cure me. It is not worth while to try to find which is the best. I will simply give it up as a hopeless case?" Not at all; he takes his last penny, if necessary, and consults the most eminent specialist he can find; or he journeys to the ends of the earth to take some famous baths which have been known to cure many similar ailments of the heart.

Or how does the modern man proceed when he has a considerable sum of money to invest? Does he exclaim impatiently "There are so many ways in which I might invest this money that I cannot take the trouble of looking into them all to see which is the safest. I do not think I will invest my money at all?" On the contrary, he takes infinite pains. He makes inquiries of all sorts of people, and ponders over reams of circulars, until he finds a safe and promising investment.

Why not follow the same course in the matter of religion as we take in the ordinary everyday matters of health and business?

After all, religion is concerned with the supreme business of the human soul. Nothing in life can be of greater importance than the relationship that exists between the soul and God. In all other matters we seek until we find what we want. That is precisely the advice that is given us in the Gospel in regard to spiritual realities,—“ Seek and ye shall find.” This is all that we ask of the educated men of to-day. Let them make an earnest study of the Bible. Never before have there been so many helps to a right understanding of the Holy Scriptures as there are to-day. Let them also study the whole history of Christianity from the beginning. Then let them make a thorough examination of the more important forms of Christianity to be found in the world to-day: inquiring what they severally have to offer for our spiritual edification and what results they have wrought in the development of nations and in the lives of men. We have good authority for applying this test of results: “ By their fruits ye shall know them.” It is utterly indefensible for an educated man to remain ignorant in such matters and to say that the search for the true Church is useless and hopeless. That kind of ignorance is most certainly culpable. It is the constant duty of all of us to try to find out the truth. Every man of moderate intelligence can learn what is the truth if he wants to find it and sincerely makes the effort.

Once upon a time a traveller was wandering in a vast forest. All day long he had wandered, seeking in vain to find a path which would lead him home. Finally the darkness came on, and he groped his way from one tree to another, hoping against hope that he might find a place where he could obtain food and lodging for the night. At last he saw a light far away through the trees. When he had come near, he found a plain, humble hut, very small; but when he knocked and the door opened, he discovered warm and generous human hearts within. They invited the stranger to join them for their evening meal and they gave him a bed for the night. There was a great joy in the heart of that stranger; for he had sought long and patiently and at last found what he sought.

This is a parable of the plight of the modern man who has not

yet found Christ. He is indeed a wanderer in a dark forest and the path of life is difficult to find. If only he would search long and patiently he would ultimately come upon the kindly and hospitable people of God; and would find food for his starving soul and rest for the night.

*Selden Peabody Delany.*

---

## The Beginnings of Church Architecture in America\*

**B**EGINNINGS are always interesting, whether it is of a world or a war, a nation or a family, and we who are making a new beginning ourselves are fortunate in possessing copies of the five volumes of the old "Ecclesiologist," the organ of "The New York Ecclesiological Society," edited by one whose name does not appear, but who (as I suspect) was Dr. William A. McVickar. The numbers were issued quarterly by Stanford and Swords at 137 Broadway. The price was \$2.00 a year, members whose fee was \$5.00 a year, probably receiving the paper free. The membership at the Society's demise numbered 109. There were monthly meetings, at first in the house of Dr. John McVickar, No. 8 College Green, between Barclay and Murray Streets, and later in the school room of St. Paul's Chapel.

The five volumes cover the years 1848 to 1852 inclusive. They are full of interest and throb with the young, vigorous, churchly life of those years — an example worthy of our imitation. They were five eventful years, marking the beginning in America of real Church architecture, liturgical science, and their allied arts of ornamentation and music.

The chosen motto of the Society was *Tabernacula Tua quam dilecta*, and well it lived up to it. The wave which had made some headway in England had already in 1848 reached these shores. We know that the two potent agencies to produce it

---

\* A paper read before The American Ecclesiological Society in the city of New York, January 19, 1917.

in England and America alike were the romanticism of Sir Walter Scott in poetry and prose, and the Oxford Movement. In this new land with its church buildings like those of early Virginia and New England, Churchmen were content to build two-story houses of a most barnlike character for divine service, or at best structures that took for their model debased examples of Sir Christopher Wren, or Grecian temples. Even as late as seventy-five years ago we were still at a great disadvantage in externals though "the gentle steadfastness of Bishop Seabury, and the steadfast gentleness of Bishop White," as Bishop Williams of Connecticut put it, combined with the fearless courage of Bishop Hobart, were vigorous influences in doctrine even before the Tractarian era. Not a single example of the Augustan age of Church Architecture of the 14th century, laid out on the primitive lines of worship in the third and fourth centuries, could be found anywhere in these United States.

Mr. Ralph Cram in his most interesting collection of papers called, "The Gothic Quest," says: "I suppose there is no more awful evidence of rampant barbarism than that which exists in the architecture of the United States between the years 1820 and 1840. Then came Upjohn, a great man, a sound architect, a leader, when the time was clamorous for such an one" (p. 146).

In the Roman Communion, except possibly in some old French or Spanish mission church, and that only in its ground plan and not in its walls and roof, this was equally true. After his desertion of the Church of England for that of Rome, Pugin published a book entitled "Contrasts," in which he does not spare the Church of his adoption in her debasement of Church architecture. He confesses he was wrong in treating Protestantism as the primary cause of this debasement, instead of regarding it as "the effect of some other more powerful agency." That "primary cause" he finds in "the decayed state of faith throughout Europe in the fifteenth century." "Religion must have been in a most diseased state," he writes, "for those two monsters, revived Paganism and Protestantism, ever to have obtained a footing, much less to have overrun the Christian world"

(Preface iii, iv, and 15). He quotes Montalembert in regard to religious art in France, who says: "The ancient pagans were at least consistent—but modern [Roman] Catholics have revived these profanities in opposition to reason—raising temples to the Crucified Redeemer in imitation of Parthenons and Pantheons." And then he adds: "Every church that has been erected, from St. Peter's at Rome downwards, are so many striking examples of the departure from pure Christian ideas and architecture" (pp. 8, 9). He confesses that Italy has been "the fountain head of the pagan revival," and St. Peter's, built with tainted money, "marks the fatal period of the great Schism" (pp. 9, 11, note).

Fortunately for England and us, the ancient buildings of our Mother Church remained in hamlet and town and Cathedral City as witnesses in stone to the ancient tradition. Nevertheless, as late as the fourth decade of the 19th century the services even in the most artistic buildings were generally most slovenly and uninspiring. That devoted English layman, Mr. Beresford Hope, tells us in his "Worship in the Church of England" that his family attended "a large and once handsome gothic church not 30 miles from London," and he gives some sadly amusing illustrations of the state of affairs from his own experience as a boy, in the reign of George IV. The verger was accustomed during sermon time to sweep the alleys so as to save himself the trouble of coming during the week. The clerk (pronounced clark) had his young cubs behind him in his part of the three-decker, and when in the midst of his arduous duty of relieving the congregation from the amens and responses, there was a disturbance behind him, the father's knuckles were often heard resounding against the woodwork when they missed the heads of the unruly brats. The same clerk was known to announce on one occasion that "the executors [accent on the penultimate] of a deceased duke" would meet at the town inn. But perhaps the climax is reached when a certain functionary read the lesson about the three children in the fiery furnace. The first time he stumbled through the barbarous Babylonian names, Shadrach, Meschech, and Abednego, but when they

appeared on the scene again, he thought discretion the better part of valor, and described them as "the aforesaid gentlemen."

Archbishop Magee tells a story concerning his own early days as a curate in England, which illustrates an attitude of mind not yet wholly absent from this American Church. The Squire of the parish came into the sacristy after service in a high state of indignation. He had found an uninvited stranger in his sacred pew, he told Magee. "I was too much of a Christian, Sir," he added, "to order him out, but I took the liberty of sitting on his hat."

My own experience as a child in one of the oldest and largest parishes in the diocese of Derry and Raphoe, the home of St. Columba, is not so different. It was a church founded by St. Colgan, a pupil of Columba, in 585, twelve years before the foundation of Canterbury. The Holy Table was a crude affair, covered with a dusty red cloth, and with well stuffed cushions at each end for the books and the elbows of the clergy. It stood in a chancel which formed the south-east corner of what might be called the nave. The pulpit, a three-decker, was at the middle of the north side, presumably for the benefit of a transept with gallery above, built on to the middle of the south side directly opposite. The clerk, a local shoemaker, gave out the key of the hymn tune on his flute until later a small, two-manual pipe organ was installed. The pews faced every way, and some were square with curtains and a table. During service in winter the sexton would proceed to poke the fires, and I remember with what awe, in the early fifties, I regarded my elder brother, home for his vacation from Trinity College, Dublin, and a disciple of the Puseyite Rector of Grange Gorman, Dr. B. W. Maturin, when he had the temerity to say the amens and responses as loudly as the clerk.

In many parishes on this side of the Atlantic, conditions were not much better. When I went to Troy in 1872, old St. Paul's, under the high-church, Dr. Thomas Coit, had the pulpit right under the east window, with the altar in front of it. The most that his successor, my friend Francis Harison, dared to do was to move the pulpit into the north corner of the chancel, at which

one of his indignant parishioners expressed to me her horror at the unheard of innovation, and promptly changed her allegiance to St. John's.

My own Mission Church, founded by Dr. Eliphalet Potter, now St. Barnabas, was the first to have the weekly Eucharist in a city of seven churches and a population of 50,000 souls, and it was through my pleading with my good friend Dr. J. I. Tucker, that he soon after introduced the custom at Holy Cross. This is all the more remarkable because for 25 years he had a most reverent and well appointed building, and an admirably rendered choral evensong, with Gregorian Plainsong, probably the first in America, and still continued under the Doctor's worthy successor.

Dr. Harison introduced the weekly Eucharist in 1873 and also installed a vested choir, the first in the Diocese of Albany, that of Holy Cross consisting then of men unvested, and the attractively uniformed girl pupils of the Mary Warren Free Institute, the endowed school of the parish. In that same year there were not more than half a dozen vested choirs in all New York City.

Such were some of the conditions in America even as late as forty years ago. In England on the other hand there was much to help in spite of the crass ignorance and indifference to art in its relation to religion. There, side by side with hideous imitation Greek temples and galleried parallelograms, where the Holy Table was a small and mean affair, and the threedecker was the one central and all-important object, there were, as I have said, in little country places and great cities alike, beautiful churches silently witnessing and teaching the new generation, when it once had its eyes opened to the departure from primitive Catholic usage, and the consequent degradation of religion in the 18th century.

In this new land 75 years ago, however, it was wholly different. Our people generally had little thought of making art the handmaid of religion. Even Churchmen were only a little in advance of their Puritan or Dissenting brethren. Material progress, comfort, and respectability in their clothes, their amusements, and their homes, occupied nearly all their attention so far as externals were concerned.

An amusing example of the meeting of the two tides stands vividly in my recollection through a vista of nearly half a century. In the early days of my ministry in Troy I was spending the evening with the two bachelor sons of Mrs. Warren, the warm friend of the elder Doane, and the munificent founder of that unique Church and School of Holy Cross. Both were devout Churchmen after their own fashion. Nathan, the elder, was completely blind from early manhood, and was the volunteer organist of the church for forty years. He had drawn the plans of the church from examples he had studied in England with some assistance in the chancel from the elder Upjohn. Stephen, the younger, was devoted to farming and other material interests. Nathan, in addition to being blind, was very deaf, and sitting on my left was discoursing enthusiastically on the beauties of Sir Walter Scott, while Stephen on my right was informing me about the cattle market in West Troy, with its horses, beeves, and pigs. In the midst of the latter's descriptions, which were not exactly in my line, his artistic brother would break in unconsciously with some lofty sentiment from Sir Walter, when the bucolic Stephen would pound on the table with the exclamation unheard by Nathan, "Confound it, I wish he would stop this interruption."

Which things are an allegory. In 1848, when the New York Ecclesiological Society was founded, American Churchmen were just getting a little awake to the fact that there was something else in religious expression than an appeal to the ear from the pulpit, that the eye in fact was the readier learner, and that the words of the old prophet were just as applicable to holy things as to the evil, when he wrote: "The stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer" (Hab. ii, 11). They had discovered in St. Paul's rebuke of the backsliding Galatians, it may be, an appreciation of a reverent ritual addressed to *all* the senses, when he writes with evident reference to the Holy Eucharist, "Before whose *eyes* Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth crucified among you" (Gal. iii, 1).

Mr. Frank Wills in his two articles on "Christian Art" in the *Ecclesiologist* for 1848 (Vol. I, pp. 49 and 97 sq.) treats in a thoroughly philosophical way the relation of art to the Christian faith. "*Theoretically*," he says, the question "assumes the form: What is the relative rank of the imagination among our spiritual powers? *Practically* it resolves itself into the query: Is there, or is there not, a distinct school of Christian art?" On its practical side he shows from reason, Scripture, and history, that "hostility to the Fine Arts has in every age been among the notes of heresy, ignorance, and sectarianism; while the voice of the Church, as well as its practice, has on the contrary been towards art — Catholic, liberal, and embracing" (p. 97).

In 1848 there were a few good architects, Churchmen, who had been learners at the older shrines, and disciples of such Englishmen as Butterfield, Ferguson, Pugin, Freeman, and Ruskin. There were the elder Upjohn, Frank Wills, Henry Dudley, and J. W. Priest, all of New York or Brooklyn, and Notman of Philadelphia.

Among the younger clergy were the McVickars, Haight, Milo Mahan, Morgan Dix, John Ireland Tucker, John Henry Hopkins, Jr., John Shackelford, Christopher Wyatt, Frank Vinton, John Henry Hobart, Elmendorf, Muhlenberg, Tuttle, Forbes, and Preston. The last two verted to Rome, but Forbes returned, and was rewarded, wisely or unwisely, by being made Dean of the General Seminary in my day, somewhat to my sorrow. Nine of these men I knew in later life, a few intimately. Hopkins was a remarkable combination — musician, artist, poet, wit, able theologian and brilliant editor, all in one. The last days of his unselfish life were lonely, but a good physician, whose praise deserves to be in the gospel, gave him a home and cared for him as a loving son for a father. Dr. Tucker was my dear friend for thirty years, the godfather of my oldest child, and a most cultured and delightful companion.

Among deeply interested laymen, non-professionals, were Charles Congdon (father of Mr. H. M. Congdon, one of our best living architects), Don Alonzo Cushman, George Maccullogh

Miller (the only survivor, and whose mother and family I knew), and Col. L. Gardner of the United States Army.

It was these and such as these who saw the need of organizing "The New York Ecclesiological Society" for the purpose of restoring to the Church and to religion those helps to the eye and ear alike which God has provided so abundantly in the physical world for the natural man. The almost three score years and ten that have glided away since the foundation of the Society have seen great changes for the better in the Church — changes, which the present generation scarcely realizes and which it largely owes to the work of these pioneers.

A brief review of Church conditions in externals at that time, and the contrast today, may help to hearten us of this generation. The new Trinity, begun in 1839, completed in 1847 at a cost of \$359,000, was the only church in the city, probably in the continent, which had any pretension to correctness, or approach to examples of the best period of Pointed Architecture. Even here there were some glaring defects, for which the Vestry, and not the Architect, Upjohn, were responsible. Among these were the shallow and gloomy chancel of  $33\frac{1}{2}$  feet in depth, an altar  $6 \times 3 \times 3$ , and a plastered ceiling imitating groined stone work, with walls of the same, and a prayer-desk facing the people. Trinity, Geneva, costing \$30,000, now a well appointed church, had a chancel only 6 feet deep and 20 feet wide. It was built in 1843. Though Trinity, New York, was consecrated in 1847, Dr. Tucker, a Brooklyn man, told me it was not till 1860 that the Rector and Vestry summoned up courage to vest their choir, and this only under cover of the visit of the Prince of Wales, as if out of respect for his royal highness, rather than from reverence for the King of kings. Eucharistic vestments, lights, cassocks, colored stoles, vested choirs, processional crosses, proper altars, reredoses, deep chancels, and a host of other things taken for granted today, were simply unknown. One thing dropped from the "ornaments of ministers" we might almost lament — the graceful "bands," still retained by French avocats, and I think also by curés.

It is interesting, and may be comforting to us, to know that the

efforts of the old Society were far from being welcomed by all the Churchmen of that day. In fact, they met with much violent opposition, as we gather from many places of the "Ecclesiologist". In the volume for 1849 the editor says, "Our opponents are chiefly remarkable for two things: first, a clamorous regard for Scripture authority, apparently demanding it for every detail, and talking as if men ought to reject everything for which plain Scripture cannot be quoted; and second, an equally clamorous and equally intelligent hatred of Popery" (Vol. II, p. 78).

The review of progress in Ecclesiology after the first year's work, in the opening number of Volume II (Oct. 1849, p. 3), is interesting as showing the difficulties encountered. After noting that "within the last quarter of a century there has been a change beginning with the revival of distinctive Church principles," even before the Oxford movement, the editor says, "Ecclesiology in America has had these several difficulties to meet and overcome: First, the want of true love of the Church and knowledge of her distinctive character; then, the want of individual desire for the embodiment of doctrine in a material edifice, the natural feeling being stifled in its infancy, or even before its birth, by the external pressure of sectarian fanaticism, and scoffing infidelity; then, the desire, if successful in struggling into existence, met with no support from past examples, or from living teachers, of which alike there was an entire want; and finally, supposing all these difficulties overcome by a singularly felicitous combination of natural temperament, education, and circumstances, in a few scattered individuals, there was yet wanting that union of means and labor which alone would produce sensible results."

Among the subjects very freely treated in the Ecclesiologist are the Origin, Form and Use of Cathedrals (particularly a cathedral for New York), the Naming and Dedication of Churches, Church Symbols, Descriptions of New Churches (Grace Church and the House of Prayer, Newark; Holy Cross, Troy; St. James the Less, Philadelphia; Holy Innocents, Hoboken, West Point, etc.). There were papers on Christian Art, the

Normal Arrangement of Churches, the Consecration of Bells and Cemeteries, Music and Chanting, Church Plate, etc. (I, 53, 54, 49 and 97; II, 63-67, 78; IV, 4; V, 29, 45, 77, 103). There are also reviews of Pugin's books and of his life, of Ferguson, and Freeman; articles from the reports of the English Ecclesiological Societies of Oxford, Exeter, etc., and friendly communications with them.

As early as January, 1852, however, we find signs of weariness and a feeling that their pioneer work had been almost done, nevertheless they "take heart and comfort from the retrospect." They see success in spite of "the pressure or prejudice so willing, nay eager, to crush our tender branches." They find progress in "almost daily letters for instruction and guidance."

On the fifth birthday of the Society, Dr. William McVickar read the annual report, in which he confesses that "its work is nearly done," and he adds, "The expression, 'We know that as well as you, and there is no necessity for your telling us that so often,' may be taken as a characteristic of this phase to which your committee feel convinced that the Society is fast approaching" (V. 137).

The last number of the magazine contains the Editor's Farewell, in which he points out that already, through the efforts of the Society, the following principles have been largely accepted: (1) Pointed Gothic of the 14th century, the highest form of Church Architecture; (2) Deep Chancels; (3) the objectionable character of rented or appropriated pews; (4) proper furniture for chancel, altars, sedilia, credence, the font near the porch, sacred vessels, cloths for altar, linen, etc. In an earlier volume, speaking of Ruskin and his Seven Lamps of Architecture, namely, Sacrifice, Truth, Power, Beauty, Life, Memory, and Obedience, the writer says most wisely: "This most practical of architectural treatises, inasmuch as it settles first principles, shows, how in church building simplicity, and rudeness even, when under the guidance of true rules, is capable of attaining results far beyond the reach of any expenditure of art, or wealth,

or skill, working *not* in accordance with these primary demands."

It is now more than three score and three years (Dec. 1853) since our worthy predecessor, "The New York Ecclesiological Society," ended its active career. Nevertheless it can be truly said that "its works do follow it." The changes that we see all around us today are largely traceable to its vigorous efforts through the five years of its brief life. But in view of this fact, it will naturally be asked, what need is there for a new society of the same kind? One answer that may be given at the outset is found in our chosen name. This is not the "New York," but the "*American* Ecclesiological Society." Our aim must therefore be to reach to the utmost limits of the land. I am writing this in the South, and in the town of my sojourn there is an Episcopal Church, evidently constructed or completed within twenty years. It is of brick, and both inside and out almost every principle laid down by Ruskin in his "Seven Lamps" is ignored, doubtless not knowingly, but for lack of guidance. I do not know the history of its erection, but from my experience as chairman of the Commission on Church Architecture in a Diocese so close to New York as to be almost a part of that city, I can make a good guess, with the almost certainty of being correct. A builder, or common house architect, in the neighborhood, probably a friend or acquaintance of the Rector or one of the Vestrymen, offers to do it "cheap," or perhaps for nothing. That is always a strong argument when money is scarce, and it appeals forcibly to the "practical" layman, that is, the man who has been described as one "whose judgment is not disturbed by looking far ahead." The building is simply hideous with battlemented tower, needless entrances, costly and ugly windows and furnishings. What is generally true of such cases, money has simply been wasted. It is not only bad art, but bad business. A fee of \$500 for mere skeleton plans of a \$10,000 building to a competent church architect, would actually have saved in cash say \$2,000, and would have saved posterity, as well as the present generation, from the lowering, not only of the artistic sense of the community, but of reverence and devotion for the House of

God. I might add that the extreme internal length of the building is 86 feet, with a chancel twelve feet deep, a mean altar, and on an elevation of (I think) only four steps above the floor of the nave.

This is but one instance of hundreds, *me teste*, all over this broad land. Verily, there is need for an *American Ecclesiological Society* and for valiant work for many years to come. It will be asked how may we set about to accomplish this in church building? I do not know a better or more helpful way than that I had the privilege of setting in motion ten years ago in the Diocese of Newark. For many years I had vexed my righteous soul over the problem of economic waste, as well as utter lack of taste in most of the new buildings which I saw. This feeling reached its culmination in a chance conversation I had with the Rector (now deceased) of a large, wealthy, and even cultivated parish near New York, about his new church project. He told me that both money and plans for a church to cost about \$70,000 had been secured. I innocently asked the name of the architect and was told it was a young man unknown to fame. On further questioning it was admitted that the gentleman had never built a church, and that he was a son or near relative of a member of the Vestry. I seemed to be growing impertinent in my questioning and ceased, but determined to observe results. I need only mention a few features of the building as completed. Externally, a piece of good mason work; internally, clerestory walls supported on square brick piers, lathed and plastered; the piers connected by horizontal beams (not arches) with windows in the clerestory that could not be distinguished from those continuous glazed openings in the side walls of our modern factories; a recess choir chancel of only 25 or 30 feet, and a chancel arch as flat as an unbent bow, in strange contrast to a high pitched roof.

This building was the proverbial "last straw," and I determined to do something to prevent for the future such shameful waste, and imposition on posterity. The result was our present Newark Canon, creating a diocesan "Commission on Church Architecture," giving complete authority over all plans for new

churches receiving aid from the diocese, and requiring all self-supporting parishes to present their plans to the Commission for "counsel and advice." For the latter no penalty is prescribed for their refusal to accept this advice, in the assured belief that no parish authorities were likely to fly in the face of a strong adverse decision.

Since that first canon was passed in 1907, the following seven dioceses have followed our example in adopting the first canon on the subject, not only in the American Church, but on the whole continent: Los Angeles, Bethlehem, Oregon, Maine, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and New York. The last two have, I believe, improved on our somewhat timid effort in Newark by increasing the personnel from four to nine, and much enlarging the scope of their authority to sites (oftentimes more important, because more permanent, than buildings), schools, rectories, windows, ornaments, etc. When it is remembered that in Richardson's *chef d'œuvre* of Trinity, Boston, there are said to be thirty kinds of pictured windows, all swearing (religiously, of course), at each other, the rule that includes glass is surely one not to be lightly set aside. The important thing, however, is to get the right men on the Board, and that is best left to the Bishop, for *any* board that he may appoint is sure to be better than our present state of diocesan or congregational anarchy.

This is only one of the directions in which the work of our new Society is needed — to help extend the movement for good Church Architecture to every Diocese, and to be a sort of central clearing house to which Diocesan Commissions and individual clergy and laity may appeal for advice.

In other ways also there is much yet to be done, and always will be. In Prayer Book Revision, during the next six, or possibly nine, years our Committee on Liturgics may be able to give valuable assistance to the Revision Commission of the General Convention — help which, I am assured by its chairman, will be greatly welcomed.

Then there is the question of *churchly*, and what is equally important, *congregational*, music where direction is sorely needed. Only a few Sundays ago I heard for the first time in

forty years that famous anthem, so dear to the old west-end quartets, Dudley Buck's *Te Deum* in E flat! A good piece of harmonized music indeed, but written rather for the glory of tenor and treble than of God. "The Minor Arts," moreover, embroidery, decoration, altar plate, furniture, etc., ought not to be left wholly to commercial firms. It may be also that the Society can publish a book or booklet of plans for mission churches, with skeleton specifications. In all these directions there is yet much work to be done which would, I am sure, prove of great service to the Church.

*Walker Gwynne.*

---

## Drink Reform, and the Example of Christ

THE simplest arrangement will best serve our purpose. Let us think of the topic just as the title presents it, under three heads, Drink, Reform, and The example of Christ.

It will help to keep our sense of proportion active, if we remind ourselves that there is an evil more appalling than the abuse of drink, namely the abuse of the sexual function. Disease, dishonor, and death attend licentiousness. Personal misery and social confusion are its invariable companions. If we are inclined to employ superlatives when we think of alcohol, recollection of this sometimes related evil may serve to keep our balance true.

First, as to drink. Its consumption is all but universal. Stimulating beverages have been imbibed always, everywhere — if not quite by all. No period of the world's history, no nation on the earth's surface but has witnessed the use of one or more of the natural or artificial nervine stimulants. From tea to hashish, narcotizing agents are found wherever men are found. Limiting our survey to alcohol, the only fragments of the race that are alcohol-free, according to Dr. John Koren, are certain aboriginal remnants in Malacca, Ceylon and among the Indians of South America.

It has been the boast of the Mohammedan world that Islam is made up of total abstainers. Theoretically all true Sons of the Prophet are teetotalers, but practically, in this connection, the prophet has very few sons. For while the Turks of Asia minor are sober, elsewhere throughout the Mohammedan world drunkenness has become common, in India and Egypt, Algeria and Morocco, in Persia and Syria.

There seems to be a craving innate in human nature to which this universal indulgence is a response. Perhaps that craving could be satisfied in some other way. Perhaps some safe and sane device may come out of the great laboratory of Europe, which just now is conducting a colossal experiment in this field. We must not prejudge the case. But leaving prophecy and speculation aside and confining ourselves to achievement, this is sure—no satisfactory substitute for alcohol has yet arrived. It doesn't matter whether we call this product a stimulant or a narcotic—whether it inhibits or accelerates cerebral action—here is a fact—men want it. Always and everywhere they have sought and used it.

Along with this universal indulgence goes—and has gone from the beginning of civilization—a recognition of the dangers that accompany alcohol. It differs from food in that it does not sound its own warning against excess—by producing a sense of repletion. Satiety comes too late to be of service. Hence the quest for some method to control or reform the drink-habit. Roughly these safety valves are of two sorts, individual and social. Men have tried to counteract thirst for alcohol by voluntary inhibition of the person concerned, acting on his own initiative; or else by legislative decree imposed without consent on a community, or some portion thereof.

In the beginning, the modern movement toward Drink Reform based itself frankly on physiological grounds. It was scientific in origin. The Ecclesiastical connection was effected somewhat later. Dr. Benjamin Rush published at Philadelphia, in 1786, an essay on “The effect of ardent spirits on the human body and mind.” Among his readers were Lyman

Beecher and Dr. J. B. Clark, who founded, with others, the first Anti-Spirits society in 1808, at Greenfield, Saratoga County, New York. Other associations, quickly formed, restricted their scope to advocacy of moderation in the use of distilled liquors—and placed no ban on fermented drinks. One society had a by-law requiring any member who became intoxicated to treat all the other members. Co-ordination of effort followed the organization of American Temperance Society in 1826. Ireland, Scotland, and England—in that order—came into line. England it was that enlarged the scope of the pledge to include beer—since fermented liquors were a prolific source of drunkenness in that portion of the United Kingdom. The reformers abstained from alcohol in every form. Then came the “battle of the pledges” which raged about the question whether an abstainer might provide alcoholic drink for his guests. Temperance—in the sense of moderate use—was definitely abandoned when the total-abstinent societies came on the field.

It is interesting that discrimination between moderate use and indefensible abuse of alcohol should have been first obscured by those who approached the subject in the name of Christ. “The Bible Christians”—a small group founded at Salford in England, in 1809, adopted a rule of abstinence from drink containing alcohol, and from flesh meats as well, while Father Matthew, who was called the Apostle of Temperance gave the total abstinence pledge to upwards of three million persons in Ireland and America. The Anglican Communion has rescued and restored the word Temperance to its primary meaning, by providing in the societies of the Church in England and in America for the moderate drinker as well as the total abstainer.

These are typical examples of the movement toward drink reform on the basis of personal consent.

Legislative devices—with which we are familiar—find their sanction in political doctrine—in America basing themselves frankly on the dogma of majority rule, supplanting fiat legislation which was the earliest resort of the reformer

in this sphere. Thus an Emperor of China in the Eleventh Century B. C. ordered all vines in the Empire uprooted. Mohammed had recourse to autocratic decree. His command to abstain was absolute, and the ready sword enforced his will. Sumptuary legislation on this continent was evoked initially in the interest of the Indian—to whom it was forbidden to sell or give alcoholic beverages. Then followed the attempt to apply legal coercion for moral purposes to the population in general. Local Option appeared in Connecticut as early as 1839, and Prohibition in Maine in 1851. Two other devices divide with these the subsequent history of legislative control of the liquor traffic. The license system is very familiar in its working. It has a two-fold function—to regulate the manufacture and sale of alcohol in the interest of the public good, and also to provide revenue for the maintenance of Government. The latter purpose has been more in evidence than the former, for there has been the irreducible minimum of effective control, and all that the traffic would bear by way of taxation. The one remaining device for ordering this inherently dangerous traffic—the Gothenberg system has yet to receive a fair test in this country. South Carolina attempted a modification of this plan, but without any large measure of success. It originated in Sweden, at Gothenberg, and reached its best development in Norway where it has had an interesting and prosperous history. Many advantages are claimed for this system. It makes the sale of all beverages having alcohol in excess of 2.25 per cent.—i. e. all but the lightest beer—a monopoly operating under close Government supervision. Public-spirited citizens of high standing serve as directors of the company. The buyer as well as the seller is licensed, and may have his right to purchase recalled if abuse of the privilege is proven. Treating is abolished, adulteration prevented—purchases are made by day-light in the open—which results in the removal of certain forms of temptation associated with the low saloon of America. The radical feature of the Gothenberg system, however, is the limitation of profit to 7 per cent. on a just capitalization of the company—thus removing decisively

the appeal to greed. In Norway, the appetite for alcohol has been divorced from huge profits and corrupt politics — a novel sight to us of America. Of more value than a study of legislative mechanics, however, is the examination of the underlying philosophy. Norway adopts the postulate that alcohol has a legitimate use. Likely as it is to overpass all limitations, and arouse the fear and dread of thinking men, it still has a legitimate use. Thus the State allows light brews to be dispensed without license, and distinguishes between beverages containing varying percentages of alcohol. She discourages the use of whiskey, e. g. by levying a graduated tax which makes distilled liquors almost prohibitive in cost.

America has adopted, in very large measure the attitude of the Prohibitionist, who maintains that alcohol is an unmixed evil, absolutely bad, as such, a veritable *malum, per se*. Thus no distinction is made between things that are different, as beer and gin, no attempt made to place the traffic in the hands of social servants and no serious effort undertaken to separate the traffic from greed of gain. The saloon with us is an outlaw, tolerated of necessity in many of the cities, driven to cover whenever possible.

Results speak for themselves. In Norway, the per capita consumption has declined steadily, but slowly. Today it is the lowest in Europe — except that of Finland. Of absolute alcohol the Norwegian consumes a little more than one-third as much as the average American. Indeed, the figures submitted by our Department of Commerce are very disquieting. In 1850, when the prohibition movement began, our per capita consumption was 4.08 gallons; in 1916, when approximately one-half our territory was showing white on Anti-Saloon league maps, the per capita consumption was 19.40 gallons, an increase of nearly 500 per cent. Of course these figures do not cover the whole case. There are qualifications, and interpretations that would need to be made were we studying the legislative history of drink reform in a comprehensive way. That is not our subject. The scanty summary of results achieved has value and relation to our proper topic only as tending to show that one idea works

better than the other. Pragmatically, temperance works; prohibition does not work a reduction in the per capita consumption of alcohol. An inherently dangerous traffic is held in check more effectually by the people who hold that alcohol has a legitimate use as a beverage than by the people who, perhaps unconsciously, have taken over the Prohibition theory of absolute evil.

Our question in chief is this, what light do we derive from the example of Christ? How did He carry Himself with reference to alcoholic drink? Of course, He was familiar with it, yet there is nothing in His example to give aid or comfort to the prohibition philosopher. The history and literature of the Hebrew people must be handled very carefully by the thinker who would argue that alcohol is an unmixed evil. Awkward questions disturb the partisan who indiscreetly reads the Psalms, which couple wine, with bread and oil—as gifts of God. A prophet does not shrink from the figure which describes Messiah as treading the wine-press alone. As with the literature, so with the life of the chosen people. The waters of the flood had scarce subsided when Noah indulges in the flowing bowl, not wisely, but too well. And from his day forward the fruit of the vine held a position of honor in the domestic, social and religious life of Hebrew people. Christ, our Lord, knew their custom in relation to alcohol as a beverage. He did not hesitate to challenge the customs of the Fathers in other directions, yet no single word of His has come down to us in condemnation of their use of wine. As with the flourishing institution of slavery, He maintained a steady silence. It would be possible to misinterpret that silence in either case. It does not of necessity imply approval. Words spoken in some other connection may in their final application spell the doom of a system of which directly He said nothing. So it is with slavery, so it may be with the organized traffic in intoxicants, as we know that traffic. Of this, more anon.

To the silence of Christ concerning wine, must be added the practice of Christ. His example was not negative. Cana of Galilee answers decisively these our neighbors who condemn

alcohol, as such. It was wine which He made, in the beginning of His ministry, that He might add to the gayety of a social feast. Again it was wine, at the end of His ministry, that He appointed as an element in the Sacrament to be offered until He come again.

Prohibition was not unknown in His day. The Nazarite was a total abstainer during the period of his vow. The Rechabites obeyed the commandment of Jonadab, their father, to drink no wine. John Baptist, His contemporary, eschewed strong drink, along with flesh food and the domestic relations. Our Lord's example cannot be explained away on the score of pre-occupation with other things. He it was who contrasted His practice with that of John, saying, "John Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a devil. The Son of man is come eating and drinking, and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." For our comfort and guidance He added but Wisdom is justified of all her children.

It is necessary to pause a moment to examine the Two-Wine theory which is no longer the last resort of desperate partisans, but has won its way into good society, being seriously quoted, e. g., by the writer on Temperance in Dodd & Mead's International Encyclopedia. This theory stresses the distinction between fermented and unfermented grape juice—arguing from the difference in terms employed by both Hebrew and Greek writers that there was a wide difference between wine and new wine. Could this point be established, it would have nothing to do with the case, since in every important passage the stronger term is used—denoting advanced fermentation. *Yayin* in the Hebrew, *Oinos* in the Greek occurs in all crucial instances.

But it is particularly unfortunate for the special pleader, in search of triumph rather than truth, that this very distinction between the terms is obscured, if not absolutely broken down in both the O. T. & N. T. Philologically, and historically, it has not a leg to stand on. *Tirosh*, new wine, Must, is described in IV Hos. 11 as producing a certain effect. This is the only

citation in O. T., but it is quite decisive. "Whoredom, and wine (*yayin*) and new wine (*tirosh*) take away the heart." There *tirosh* appears as the climax of debasing influences, and does so in immediate connection with *yayin*.

As to the contrast between *oinos* and *gleucos*, it breaks down also. In the reply of St. Peter to the jeers of the mob on Pentecost. They cried, "these men are full of new wine (*gleucos*)."  
His defense, if it means anything is an acknowledgment that *gleucos* could produce an intoxication—exhilaration equal to that influence of the Holy Spirit which quite carried his companions out of themselves. There is no need to labor at the point. So far as our Lord's example is concerned the distinction might be perfectly valid without disturbing the significance of His teaching in the matter, since *oinos* is the word used in comparing Himself with John, as *oinos* is the word descriptive of His great Sign given at Cana of Galilee.

So much for the lawfulness of alcoholic drink. Here we stand on firm ground. Our Lord uttered no word of protest against it, as used in the home, in social entertainment, in the service of the Temple. Further, He used His Almighty power to produce it at the beginning of His ministry and at the end commanded His Disciples to offer it in the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. It is the teaching of His life and lawful. They who would treat alcohol as evil, per se, must mutilate the Scriptures beyond recognition. Learned and labored dissertations on *Yayin* and *Tirosh*, on *Oinos* and *Gleucos* are quite beside the mark. Alcohol is lawful.

But that does not close the subject of Drink reform. That wine and other beverages have their use is no sort of defense for the system of traffic in drink, which we know—a system that ministers to greed of gain, debases our politics, and allies itself with the basest, most pernicious influences in the Nation.

This detail of our Lord's example must not obscure for us the great and general bearing of His teachings. We do not of necessity follow Christ when we drink wine, any more than we should were we to wear His oriental dress and speak His Aramaic tongue. Granted the lawfulness of alcohol needs to be

asserted with all vigor; but in direct proportion to our emphasis on its lawfulness, must be our allowance of weight to the question of its expediency. It is lawful, is it expedient?

No short and simple answer will be attempted by the writer, since his conviction is constant that no short or simple answer to this question can be either wise or true. Two tests will occur to every Christian, the test of its effect on his individual character — the test of its influence on the social fabric.

Does alcohol work in any sense against purity of heart in me, against hunger and thirst after righteousness? These are personal questions which you cannot answer for me, which having been answered for myself must be brought into agreement with that heroic counsel: "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee."

On the social side the test is of like character. Does my indulgence in a commodity, perfectly innocent, one that maketh glad the heart of man, cause my brother to stumble, and stray, does it offend one of these little ones for whom Christ died? Here we come into the region of expediency. These are typical and fair tests of expediency. They may safely be left, where of necessity they must be left, to the sensitive consciences of His Disciples.

The nineteenth century saw the abolition of slavery as an institution. Christ's teachings in respect to the worth of the individual lay behind that achievement. This twentieth century — this very decade of it — may well see the destruction of the present system of exploiting the appetite for drink. That appetite will be with us when the present system has departed. We shall be prepared to deal with the appetite more wisely than before — if we stop lying about alcohol — distinguish between its use and abuse, and gird up the loins of our minds, to apply to the conditions of a chastened world the example of Christ.

*Wilson E. Tanner.*

---

"Christ is God, and Christ is Man" is the verdict and judgment of historic Christianity; it will not do to say that Christ

is "Divine," for in a sense we are all "Gods," but Christ is "of one substance with the Father," which we certainly are not.

Let us be quite clear about this point: Christianity as it has come down to us through the ages has been the religion of God made Man. One might imagine an intellectual necessity to deny this central truth and maintain that Jesus Christ was only a man; but, if so why call the resulting religion Christianity? Christianity has a perfectly definite and historical meaning and connotation—it is the religion of Jesus Christ, God the Son made Man; if you extract the marrow and core of the Christian religion, is it honest, or even reasonable to call the remainder by the old name? It is really an attempt to get the custom of the old firm by killing it and stealing its good will.

Christianity without Christ as God might conceivably be a true religion, but it is not historic Christianity; a new religion should get a new name.

*Walter J. Carey.*

## The Proposed Rubric Concerning Reservation

WHERE allowed by the ordinary, and subject to his direction, the "priest may reserve so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as may be required on that day for the Communion of the sick. But all that is not so required shall be reverently consumed before the Blessing or immediately thereafter."

This proposed rubric has been regarded in two ways:

(a) As a proposal to permit, within certain bounds, in those dioceses only in which the ordinary allows it, a practice now forbidden throughout the American Church, and

(b) As a proposal to throw restrictions about a practice not now forbidden.

The first of these positions is based upon an assumption, widely entertained in the nineteenth century, and still quite

prevalent, that the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament is forbidden in our present Book of Common Prayer.<sup>1</sup>

Such a prohibition is thought to be found in the second rubric on p. 240:—"And if any of the Consecrated Bread and Wine remain after the Communion, it shall not be carried out of the Church; but the Minister and other Communicants shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same."

It is generally admitted, even by the opponents of reservation, that this rubric was not framed for the purpose of forbidding that practice but was aimed at a sacrilegious abuse of the consecrated elements.<sup>2</sup> It is sometimes<sup>3</sup> maintained, however, that whatever the intention of its framers, the rubric is so worded, whether by inadvertence or otherwise, that it does actually forbid all reservation.

The legal principle invoked by these opponents of reservation is a perfectly sound one. We may not go behind the plain wording of a law.<sup>4</sup> But where there is reasonable doubt as to the meaning of words, these words are best interpreted with reference to (a) the intention of their writers, (b) harmony with the rest of the code to which the law in question belongs.

<sup>1</sup> "— But however desirable a *restoration* of reservation for the sick may be, it will be impossible to gain the Church's permission for it, while reservation for the purposes of adoration is practiced and widely advocated." (Bishop of Vermont. Charge at Diocesan Convention 1916.) Italics mine.

Two ideas are suggested here: (a) that reservation is now forbidden by the "Church" (*i. e.* the body known in law as The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America) and (b) that reservation for purposes other than communion is practiced and widely advocated in the same "Church." With this second suggestion I propose to deal in a later part of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> This rubric, first introduced in A. D. 1661, was not intended as a concession to the puritans but was clearly understood as a rebuke to the irreverence of some of them who carried the sacrament home to be used as common food. Contemporaries do not seem to have regarded it as a prohibition of reservation. It seems exceedingly probable, for instance, that Bp. Jeremy Taylor (*d.* 1667) practiced reservation.

<sup>3</sup> *Sometimes*. Not always or by all competent authorities. It is well to lay some stress on this point since it is often carelessly assumed that the advocates of reservation are wittingly pleading the animus of the framers against the plain wording of the rubric, which would be bad law. There would be no need for conscientious resistance to the plain prohibition of reservation in this rubric if such prohibition were actually discerned there, since reservation could be quite legally made at private celebration. (This is treated more fully in a later part of this paper.) For further justification for the use of "sometimes," cf. A History of the Book of Common Prayer p. 39 (J. H. Maude), and other citations in the text and notes of this paper.

<sup>4</sup> This is, of course, true of all rubrics, *e. g.*, the quite unambiguous one at the end of the confirmation service.

It will be seen that a great deal depends upon the meaning of the word "Communion" in our present rubric. "The Communion" can mean, and is traditionally employed as meaning that portion of the Liturgy at which the faithful are communicated together with the devotions immediately surrounding that act; those, that is, which follow the consecration and precede the last collects and blessing. This would appear to be a legal meaning of the word "Communion" in our Prayer Book. It seems to be so employed in the second last rubric in The Ordering of Deacons, in the second last rubric in The Ordering of Priests, and in the last rubric in The Consecration of Bishops.

"Communion," then, having primary reference to the act of communicating,<sup>5</sup> it is competent to maintain, knowing the mind of the framers, that "after the Communion" cannot be taken to mean, of necessity, "before the Communion" of those suddenly afflicted by disease or accident has been provided for.

It is sometimes urged, however, that to interpret the rubric as not forbidding reservation, puts it out of harmony with the spirit of the Prayer Book since that book provides us with another method for the Communion of the Sick and that this in itself establishes a legal intention to forbid the communion of the sick with the reserved Sacrament. This argument is not merely weak; it is disastrous to the legal case against reservation since:—

(a) It shows that the animus of the Prayer Book is to the effect that the communion of the sick is important and not, as some opponents of reservation maintain, unnecessary or even superstitious. Therefore THE COMMUNION OF THE SICK cannot be urged against the use of the reserved Sacrament in those emergencies<sup>6</sup> for which it does not provide.

<sup>5</sup> The term *ante-communion*, still frequently heard, though itself inaccurate when applied only to that part of the liturgy which precedes the Prayer for Christ's Church Militant, shows that the use of the word Communion as applied to the whole service is of recent origin, probably arising from *The Communion* appearing at the top of each page. Printers' abbreviations, however, have no legal force.

<sup>6</sup> It is common to think of injury by accident or sudden disease as constituting these emergencies. But experience in the mission field suggests another exigency. Where one priest ministers to scattered Christians in a large number of places separated by long and expensive journeys, the reserved Sacrament must become the normal mode for the communion of the dangerously ill. Private celebrations cannot be had without a priest, but communion can be administered by a deacon (just as in the public Service in Church) or, in extreme need, by a catechist.

(b) It shows that the Prayer Book has no animus against the consecrated Elements being "carried" outside of the Church for the purposes of communion and thus strengthens the contention that the rubric simply forbids their being carried out for a less reverent purpose.

(c) *The Communion of the Sick* does not contain the rubric in question<sup>7</sup> and the wording of that rubric is such that it cannot possibly apply to a private celebration. Thus, even if it could be shown that the rubric is a legal prohibition of reservation at the public service, there would be nothing to prevent the reservation of the Sacrament from one private celebration to another. Nor could a priest, so doing, be accused of moral obliquity, for he would, in a legal manner, simply remedy an inadvertence of wording on the part of those who in A. D. 1661 intended to prevent not reservation but sacrilege. Indeed the omission of any such rubric from *The Communion of the Sick* is but added evidence, if any were needed, that the rubric was written to prevent an abuse in the public Service.

Finally, while the opponents of reservation for the communion of the sick do sometimes attempt to rest a theoretical case upon the rubric, they have not, so far as I know, thought it of sufficient practical value to be used in promoting the trial before an ecclesiastical court of any of the many clergy who do reserve the Blessed Sacrament.<sup>8</sup> It is practically certain that such a trial would be promoted if the legal case against reservation were thought by all opponents of the practice to be indubitably sound.

All that has been said will, I hope, suffice to show that we must regard the suggested new rubric as a proposal to restrict a practice which is not now forbidden, and, in some localities, to forbid a practice which, as things now stand, cannot legally be prevented.

---

<sup>7</sup> The second on p. 240 of the Prayer Book.

<sup>8</sup> i. e. for that reason only.

It is certain that loyal catholics, in such a trial, would have the additional advantage of entering court with clean hands apart from the particular question before the judges. It is in another direction that we must look for habitual and, indeed, contemptuous disregard for the provisions of rubrical law.

For, with regard to a law whose language may be considered (this is stating the case for the opposition at its strongest) not quite clear, it is apparent that the mind of its framers suggests an interpretation not unfavourable to reservation. And such an interpretation is not foreign to the spirit of the Prayer Book but is, rather, consistent with it. This we have shown.

I proceed then, to examine the restrictions which it is proposed to throw about the practice of reservation "where allowed by the ordinary."

Some persons have thought that this rubric, if adopted, will forbid the reservation of the Sacrament unless it be known to the priest that some person or persons are to be communicated with the reserved Sacrament "on that day." But I do not think that the words "so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as *may* be required on that day etc.,"\* ought to be understood in that sense. Consistency seems to require us to take the words as meaning that the priest may reserve so much as will probably serve in the case of any unforeseen emergency of which there is reasonable possibility. This seems to be the only proper interpretation of the words because communion with the reserved Sacrament has been urged principally as an emergency provision and also since to understand the rubric otherwise might make it practically do away altogether with private celebrations where reservation is "allowed by the ordinary."

Thus the only restriction provided in this rubric where reservation is "allowed by the ordinary" is that it shall be "subject to his direction." Reservation, if allowed at all in a diocese, might (were this rubric in force) be allowed in but one parish or Church or in all, or in some only. The ordinary would have the power to "direct" the most extreme "extra-liturgical use" of the Sacrament, or he might restrict reservation to a closet and prohibit any sort of reverence to the "consecrated Bread and Wine."

As the bishop has an undoubted right under our present laws to forbid, in parish or diocesan churches, *services* (such as

---

\* Italics mine.

Benediction), in honor of the reserved Sacrament (it is indeed doubtful that he has any right to allow them<sup>9</sup> except, perhaps, on special occasions),<sup>10</sup> the rubric, if adopted, will operate mainly on behalf of those bishops who would forbid to the faithful any access whatever to the reserved Sacrament and who, to attain this end, would subject the "consecrated Bread and Wine" to indignities quite foreign to the mind of the Church and to the spirit of our liturgy. For it seems inconsistent to provide that the Sacrament shall be treated (as our present Prayer Book requires) with considerable reverence for a certain interval after the Communion but to allow a bishop to order that it shall be treated with much less reverence after that interval has elapsed. If it were urged that *all* reverence should cease at once when the last person had communicated, one could, admit, at least, a certain consistency in the contention. But if it be right to place the Sacrament upon the Altar after the Communion, to recite before It an *Our Father* and a thanksgiving, to sing *Gloria in Excelsis* or some other hymn of adoration, it cannot be intrinsically wrong to allow the reservation, upon or near the main Altar for a somewhat longer period, of so much "as may be required" for an emergency communion. Many objects are treated with reverence because of what they are in themselves, or because of the purposes for which they are used (e. g., Church Buildings), but it would be absurd to maintain that they were created simply in order to receive the respect which is, nevertheless, their due. The question of which I am at this moment treating is one of reverence, and this question arises immediately after the Consecration, before, not after, reservation. It has nothing to do with the purpose for which the consecrated Elements are reserved. It is entirely concerned

<sup>9</sup> Book of Common Prayer p. vii "Concerning the Service of the Church ¶ 3."

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. ¶ 4. We are here concerned with the *legal* — not the theological aspects of this imaginary Bishop's position. Note, in passing, that Roman origin has not prevented the wide acceptance of the "three hours' service" which originated with a Jesuit in ("that country without religion"!!) — South America.

with what they have become.<sup>11</sup> This is the crucial point and is the hidden line of cleavage<sup>12</sup> in the whole dispute. It cannot be doubted on which side the Catholic Church<sup>13</sup> and our liturgy stand.

The purpose in reserving the Sacrament is Communion at some time after the public Service. No new question of reverence or honour arises after the end of that service. The provisions of the Service itself determine the attitude of the Prayer Book to the Consecrated Elements to be one of reverence.

It seems quite clear that, under our present rubrics and canons, the bishops have the legal right to surround the practice of reservation with every reasonable restriction. It would appear inadvisable and contrary to Catholic (including Anglican) tradition to increase these powers.<sup>14</sup>

The framers of the suggested rubric may have intended that it should operate to forbid all reservation where not expressly

<sup>11</sup> The Bishop of Oxford, in a learned article, *The Theological Bearings of Certain Extra-Liturgical Uses of the Blessed Sacrament* (Eng. Ch. Review, Feb. 1917), seems to urge the possibility that access to the reserved Sacrament may obscure the teaching of (1) the Real Presence and (2) the realization of Christ's abiding presence in the Church and the faithful. I can quite see how, if we were arguing entirely before the event, his lordship's arguments would carry great weight. But with the known fact that the opponents of the "Real Presence" are also unanimously opposed to reservation whereas those who defend reservation unanimously accept the teachings, the bishop's arguments lose some of their significance. But the article is distinctly worth reading and contains a number of useful cautions. His description of current Roman teaching is repudiated by some Roman Catholics. cf H. T. W. in the *Church Times*, March 9, 1917.

<sup>12</sup> I do not mean to say that all opponents of reservation openly deny or secretly disbelieve the teaching of the Catholic Church on this point. I mean that it is this disbelief which is the main strength of the opposition. So much irrelevant matter has been forced into the controversy by the other side that unfounded apprehensions have been aroused in a few cases by those ordinarily on the Catholic side.

<sup>13</sup> I read with utter amazement the implied statement that reservation "for purposes of adoration is practiced and widely advocated" among us. (See first foot-note of this article). I am reasonably well acquainted with a number of catholic-minded clergymen; I have visited their parishes; I have read their books. Never once, so far as I remember, have I heard of or seen reservation for any purpose other than that of communion advocated by an American (or, indeed, any other) clergyman. If reservation for the purposes of adoration were *widely* advocated among us I ought, certainly, to have found some inkling of it. So far as I know, it is not advocated at all; though I am quite well aware that reverence for the Sacrament (in greatly varying degrees) is practiced and widely advocated in entire loyalty to the letter and spirit of our formularies.

<sup>14</sup> Cf the quotations at the end of this article.

“allowed by the ordinary.” If that was their intention they were unfortunate in the wording of the proposed law. The second rubric on p. 240 is to be entirely replaced by the new law should be it be passed in its present form by two successive General Conventions.

It will be seen that while the new law will tell the priest what he is to do with the remainder of the “consecrated Bread and Wine” where reservation is “allowed by the ordinary,” he is left without any directions whatever in this matter where reservation is not “allowed by the ordinary.” Thus the right of a bishop to regulate the proceedings of the priest at this point will be wholly dependent upon his willingness to allow reservation. If he does not expressly allow it, he cannot restrict it at all. He will then leave to the celebrant a far wider discretion than that which he now enjoys.

But we are really, at this time, more concerned with the assumption underlying the proposal than with the language in which it is embodied: i. e., the assumption that the right to forbid reservation inheres in the episcopal office and can rightly be exercised by a diocesan bishop.

If it be right to provide by reservation for the communion of those who might, otherwise, be deprived of their viaticum, it cannot be right for a diocesan to forbid it, except in a diocese where there is no possibility of sudden illness or accident and where there is at all hours a plentiful supply of disengaged priests. It is safe to assume that there is no such diocese.

If, on the other hand, reservation be always wrong, no bishop should be authorized to allow it.

If, as the proposers of the new rubric tacitly admit, reservation is sometimes right, no bishop can make it always wrong within his diocese.

#### IV

I close this paper with a few quotations from the recent writings of one of our best known and most trustworthy theologians.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Dr. Darwell Stone.

"The reservation of the Sacrament and the approach of Christians to it in private prayer do not appear to require in parish churches positive episcopal sanction." <sup>16</sup>

"The 1661 rubric 'if any remain of that which was consecrated it 'shall not be carried out of the Church' was not felt to be a difficulty; for the historical purpose of that rubric was to prevent not reservation but sacrilege." <sup>17</sup>

"Further, if the parish priest was to reserve at all, history and reason and reverence pointed to his parish church as the right place; and when the Sacrament was reserved, it was but acting on the true instincts of a worthy devotion if he allowed his faithful people to pray to our Lord there present." <sup>18</sup>

"In this particular matter it" (The Privy Council !!) "rightly interpreted the phrase by the explanation 'The oath of canonical obedience does not mean that the clergyman will obey all the commands of the bishop against which there is no law, but that he will obey all such commands as the bishop by law is authorized to impose.'" <sup>19</sup>

"In some circumstances a prohibition to reserve would not be a 'godly admonition' since it might mean a hindering or preventing due administration of Communion; and, if the Sacrament is reserved, a command that faithful souls are not to adore our Lord there would be very far from 'godly.'" <sup>20</sup>

*John Cole McKim.*

Patience soon replies: God doth not need

Either man's work, or His own gifts: who best  
Bear His mild yoke, they serve Him best: His state  
Is kingly; thousands at His bidding speed

And post o'er land and ocean without rest.  
They also serve who only stand and wait.

— *Milton.*

<sup>16</sup> The Reserved Sacrament p. 115.

<sup>17</sup> Church Times, March 9, 1917, p. 210, col. 1.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. col. 2.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. col. 3.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid. col. 4.

## Expressions of the Communion of Saints

“**T**HERE are two expressions of the communion of saints on the restoration of which in our common as well as our private worship we ought to insist.

“1. We must recover without apology or concealment the practice of prayer for the dead. It is a matter of revelation that the departed are alive and waiting their final perfection. They need something as we need something. And therefore we may pray for them. That is a practice inevitable resulting from the revealed belief about the efficacy of prayer for others in all their real needs. I should contend that S. Paul prayed for his dead friend Onesiphorus (2 Tim. i, 18). I am sure that the church has always prayed for the dead, for light and refreshment and peace, and that they may receive forgiveness and mercy of the Lord. I do not want to define. But I must insist on my right to pray, leaving all unknown things in God's hands. And I must demand this right, by legitimate authority, in the public services.

“2. Besides praying for our dead generally, besides keeping again our All Soul's Day, we should remember specially the heroes of our faith, those whom in a special sense we call saints. The ancient church used to commemorate them solemnly by name. Moreover, believing that nothing could be more practically certain than that the perfected spirits were occupied in spiritual activity, and that their larger love, in the unseen world, must lead them to pray for us who remain in this world, the ancient church desired to have them for intercessors, and solemnly asked God that it might be allowed to benefit by their intercessions. S. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks thus of the commemoration of the dead, which in his days followed the consecration of the eucharist. ‘Afterwards we make mention also of those who have fallen asleep, first of patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God by their prayers and intercessions will receive our supplications. Then also (we pray) on behalf of our holy fathers and bishops, and generally of all those who

have fallen asleep among us, believing that there will be the greatest benefit to the souls of those on whose behalf our prayer is offered up while the holy and tremendous sacrifice is amongst us ' (Catechesis myst. v. 9).

" I should earnestly wish to see restored amongst us the public commemoration, as in the First Prayer Book (1549), of ' the wonderful grace and virtue, declared in all Thy saints from the beginning of the world; and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs;' and I would have this general commemoration accompanied not only as in the First Book, by direct prayers for the dead generally, but also by a specific request to God that we may be allowed the benefit of the intercession of the saints.

" This has been called *comprecation*. But the main body of the church, since the fifth century of its life, has not been satisfied without directly asking the saints for their prayers (*invocation*), though it was long before these direct invocations were admitted into the public services. As to this I do not feel that anything could be more natural; but it cannot be denied that, to sustain it, we need the assurance that we can have direct access to the saints, and that they can directly hear us; and it is exactly this which the church, by the admissions of its theologians, is not authorized to give us. The theologians of the medieval church tell us only that the saints are allowed to see us and our needs in God; which I suppose may be expressed in other words by saying that, if we cannot get at them to address them directly, yet we can be sure that God will disclose to them what He sees fit that they should know. But, if this is so, it would seem to follow that we had better make our prayers to God that He will be pleased to let the saints know our needs and let us profit by their prayers. The instinct of invocation, however, has been widespread and almost irresistible. It is not only Romish, for the Christians of the East use it as much as the Christians of the West. They address with familiar confidence not only the famous saints but their own departed friends. Certainly we are not called upon to forbid such invocation. But the sense

of what is not revealed to us should restrain our use of it, even in private, and, following the practice of the ancient church, we should admit into our public services no prayers but those addressed to God.”

*Bishop Charles Gore.*

## Recollections of Father Stanton

“I T was only by accident that I was brought into personal contact with him, for I had intended to make my first confession to the Vicar; but on the evening that I sought him at the clergy house he was away, and I was told that Father Stanton would see me. And no words can describe the strong, tender way in which he ministered to me in their little oratory, or the joy and gratitude that I felt as I walked back to my lodgings. I occasionally sought his aid in this way until I found another Confessor at Cambridge. When I wrote him on the eve of my ordination, thanking him for what he had done for my soul, I got a characteristic reply: ‘ My dear fellow, I haven’t the least remembrance of you: but I am very thankful if I have been of any use to you;’ adding some words of stimulating counsel. Two or three years later, when Stuart Donaldson (the late Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge, and then an Eton Master) and I were reading with Dr. Westcott, at Westminster, we took the liberty of calling at Brooke street, and the Father, who received us with delightful courtesy in his sitting-room (where one of his postmen friends was enjoying his company) quickly saw that the atmosphere of St. Alban’s was a novel experience to Donaldson, and was quite prepared to shock him a little. He began by speaking somewhat bitterly of the hard treatment the ecclesiastical authorities had dealt out to St. Alban’s and himself. Then, in view of the postman’s presence, I began to ask him some questions about the St. Martin’s League. ‘ Oh!’ he said, turning to the postman. ‘ We’re a bad lot, aren’t we, Bill? not at all pious! But, let me see, we had one pious chap, only, unfortunately, he went and stole something, and got six months. I paid him a visit in gaol, and cheered him up a

bit, and told him it was the best thing for him to be locked up a bit. He'd come out all right.' Then he proceeded to tell us of one of his conversations at their Club—how one of the postmen said to him one night, 'Dad, they say you believe in Purgatory. Is that true?' 'Well,' he replied, 'I don't know about that. But now, suppose this roof fell in and killed you all. Where do you think you and I would go to? Would you go straight to heaven? (Silence.) No, I am afraid not. You know you aren't quite fit for heaven. Would you go to hell? No, you aren't such bad chaps after all. You'd do each other a good turn if any one was down on his luck. There must be some middle place that would suit most of us. You may call it Purgatory, if you like.' "

*Very Reverend F. E. Carter.*

## With Christ

**L**ORD, where Thou art our happy dead must be;  
 Unpierced as yet the Sacramental Mist,  
 But we are nearest then when nearest Thee  
 In solemn Eucharist.

O Lord, we crave for those gone home to Thee,  
 For those who made our earthly home so fair;  
 How little may we know, how little see!  
 Only that Thou art there.

Dear hands, unclasped from ours, are clasping Thee,  
 Thou holdest us forever in Thy Heart;  
 So close the One Communion — are we  
 In very truth apart?

Lord, where Thou are our blessed dead must be,  
 And if with Thee, what then their boundless bliss!  
 Till Faith is sight, and Hope reality,  
 Love's anchorage is this.

*(Memoir of Arthur Stanton, page 275.)*

## Luther and Freedom of Thought

*From America*

LUTHER has often been hailed as the champion of freedom of thought. Men were "emancipated" by him from the spiritual authority of the Pope to whom Christ had committed the keys of His Kingdom and the care of His flock. But for the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, Luther substituted his own authority which brooked no rivalry or contradiction. "We believed," wrote the Protestant theologian Braun in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* for March 30, 1913, "that we owed to him the spirit of toleration and liberty of conscience. Yet there is not a shadow of truth to this." Discerning Protestant critics admit it was never Luther's wish that there should be religious toleration for anyone except himself. "In speaking of Luther," says the Protestant historian Walter Köhler, "there can be absolutely no question of liberty of conscience or freedom of religion." (*"Reformation und Ketzerprocess."*)

It is true that at times Luther apparently preached a doctrine of toleration, as when he said that neither Pope, nor angel nor man is to rob the Faithful of their liberty; but that liberty, as will be made clear, was to consist in forced conformity with every article of his creed, even the least. In the beginning of his career the Reformer demanded full freedom for the preaching of his doctrine which stood in such startling opposition to the Faith of fifteen centuries of Christianity. "As for combating heretics," he declared, "let the Bishops see to that. It is their function, not the office of princes; for heretics can never be combated by force. . . . Here the Word of God must do battle." (*M. Luther's "Sämtliche Werke."* Erlangen Edition, Vol. XXII., p. 90.) Yet no one ever more studiously urged the princes to apply force when there was question of advancing his own doctrine and prohibiting every other. Therefore the words quoted, though often cited by his eulogists, are not meant to convey principle of any general religious toleration.

To establish this thesis it will be sufficient to consider the

Reformer's attitude towards his fellow-Protestants. His intolerance of Catholics and their doctrines is too patent to call for proof. In his final work, "The Papacy an Institution of the Devil," the last will and testament of a hatred that verged upon insanity, he wrote: "Hang up the Pope, the Cardinals, and all the Papal rabble. Tear out their blaspheming tongues, and fix them on a gibbet, as they clap their seals to their Bulls." As for the Jews, he demanded in his work, "About the Jews and Their Lies" (Edition 1543), that their Synagogues be burned, their houses broken down and destroyed and their rabbis forbidden to teach under pain of death. "Force them to work," he exclaims, "and treat them with every kind of severity, as Moses did in the desert and slew 3,000." Further illustrations would be superfluous.

In vain did his fellow-sectaries, to whom he had given the example of separation from the Mother Church, claim for themselves the privilege of private interpretation of the Scriptures. They might indeed have it, he said imperiously, but they must in that case agree with him on every point of his new doctrine, for "On the foundation of the Holy Scriptures, I have overwhelmed and overcome all my opponents." (Erlangen Ed., Vol. LVIII., p. 6.) To disagree with him was dishonesty which deserved punishment. Writing to the Elector, John of Saxony, February 9, 1526, Luther urged him, in the name of law and order, to permit no other doctrine besides his own: "In one place there should be one kind of sermon only."

Luther's proposed methods of dealing with those who ventured in any way to differ from him in religious belief is fully set forth in his explanation of Psalm 82. He distinguishes two classes of heretics. The first embraces all those who without authoritative commission from the Lutheran princes thrust themselves into the office of preaching. Such men he regarded not merely as a source of spiritual danger but as a possible cause of public disorder in a town where no Scripture interpretation except that of Luther was to be permitted by the public authorities. Any citizen who hears such a one is under obligation, by his oath as a citizen, Luther says, to denounce him

to the city officials. "If he does not desist, the authorities will commend such a fellow to the proper master, the Master Executioner." (Erlangen Ed., Vol. XXXIX., pp. 250-254.) The popular name given to the latter was "*Meister Hans*." Luther's frequent allusions to him are to be taken seriously, for they were acted upon by the local princes and brought many a poor fellow to the block or to the stake. In the year 1527 alone twelve men and one woman were executed by the Elector John, Luther's special favorite at this time. (Grisar, Vol. III., p. 735.)

It is true that in the case of the Anabaptists there had been considerable disorder. Yet perfectly peaceful citizens were executed for their religious beliefs only. "It is characteristic of the want of information concerning the real happenings of the epoch," writes the Protestant historian of the Reformation, L. Keller, "that very many even at the present day proceed on the supposition that the executions and persecutions of the Anabaptists took place merely because of public disturbances, and that the Reformers had no part in them." (Grisar, Vol. III., p. 747.) Of these same executions, which form but one phase of Luther's "mania for persecution," as a Protestant historian calls it, P. Wappler, likewise a Protestant author, says:

The numerous executions of such Anabaptists too who, according to evidence, were no disturbers of the peace, yet who were killed in precise conformity with the directive explanations of the Wittenberg theologians, give too plain a testimony against all attempts of writers who would still deny the clear fact that Luther approved of the death penalty inflicted *for the exclusive reason of heresy*. ("*Die Stellung Kursachsens, etc.*," p. 125.)

The second class of heretics, according to Luther's category, includes those who are entirely peaceful but presume "to preach publicly against an article of faith." They do not fare at his hands much better than the first class, and in practice, as we have seen, were often made to suffer the death-penalty. "These too are not to be suffered," Luther says of

them, "but are to be punished as public blasphemers." (Erlangen Ed., Vol. XXXIX., pp. 250-254.)

Luther did not give vent to his "mania for persecution" all at once. As late as 1528 he had not advocated the death-penalty for Anabaptists, but was content with approving the edict which interdicted their writings and those of other heretics. In 1530, however, he wrote the plain words quoted above in which Anabaptists and all other heretics were, under the given circumstances, commended to the tender mercies of the Master Executioner. In one word, as the Protestant historian, H. Barge, admits in his work, "*Andreas Bodenstein*," Luther's method of preserving the purity of his doctrine was "to mobilize the police." His last argument was the hangman.

In defending his actions Luther constantly writes that he does not in reality force men to believe against their consciences, but that he merely makes them conform outwardly, by forcing them to attend Lutheran instructions, build Lutheran schools and churches, and support the men who preach his doctrine. It is difficult to see how any further compulsion could possibly be exercised. "They must be forced to hear the sermons, whether or not they believe the Gospel," he wrote to Pastor Thomas Löscher regarding those who opposed his new doctrines. "If they would live among the people they should learn the law of the same people, even though unwilling." ("*Briefwechsel*," Vol. VII, p. 151.) The law in question was the religious creed laid down according to Luther's interpretation of the Scripture. "For the sake of the Ten Commandments," he wrote to Joseph Levin Metzsch, "let the people be driven to the sermon that they may at least learn the external works of obedience." (Erlangen Ed., Vol. LIV., p. 67.)

In the case of preachers who differed from him Luther insisted that there was no need of any nice hearing of testimony. Local authorities, in punishing them, might dispense with it entirely. Least of all was there to be any discussion with such men, he told the Landgrave Philip of Hesse. But the climax was reached when Luther signed Melancthon's document. It is a defense of the death-penalty not only for the

“blasphemers” who maintained that “men could become holy without sermons or church service,” but also for their adherents and deceivers who persist in saying that “Our Baptism and sermon are not Christian, and our Church is not the Church of Christ.” This *magno charta* of religious intolerance, directed mainly against the Anabaptists, was signed by Luther with the words: “It pleases me, M. Luther.” (Grisar, Vol. III., p. 732.)

By Luther’s principles, wrote the Protestant Church historian, Neander, “All oppressive domination of a State religion, and all tyranny over the conscience of men could be sanctioned. *His views were the same as those on which the Roman Emperors had acted in persecuting the Christians.*” (“*Das Eine und Manigfaltige des Christlichen Lebens*,” p. 224.)

It is claimed that the Reformer moderated his mania for religious persecueion during his last days, but the evidence is far from convincing. A sermon preached at Eisleben, February 7, 1546, is quoted in this connection. It is an explanation of the parable of the cockle, and Luther points the obvious moral that “with human force and power we cannot extirpate (heretics) nor change them.” Without any reference to the duties of princes he tells his ordinary hearers that they are to see to it that heretics are not permitted to rule among them, to enter the pulpit or approach the altar. Luther’s principles always turned upon expediency, and the key to this modification of his extreme intolerance may be found in his cautious remark that an attempt to extirpate the cockle by force might make it worse. There were not a few “unbelievers” in Eisleben who had probably to be reckoned with.

Little of the spirit of even this modified and questionable toleration is shown, as Grisar points out, in the sermon immediately preceding and the one immediately following it, the last of Luther’s life. In the former he demands of the citizens of Halle that the “scabby, shabby, lousy monks,” who still remained there, be thrown out of their town. In the latter he insists that the Jews “be not suffered nor tolerated.” They

are all to be instantly banished. It cannot be doubted that he could still have expressed himself as no less sincerely "delighted" at the murder of heretics as when, on receiving the premature announcement of the execution for heresy of John Campanus, he wrote to Justus Jonas, August 3, 1530, "*Lactus audiui:*" "I was delighted to hear of it." (*Briefwechsel*," Vol. VIII., p. 163.)

Have non-Lutherans who are now lauding Luther as the apostle of freedom of thought ever considered what would have become of them had they expressed their religious convictions in Luther's favorite Saxony or in any State where he held sway? Had they dared to disagree with the Reformer, in all probability they would have been clapped into prison and possibly executed without much ceremony. And even if a more lenient course were followed, they certainly would have been silenced at once. If they disobeyed the order, however, and continued to preach their doctrine, there is little doubt that they would have been banished with threats of dire happenings should they ever presume to return. Lastly, did they persist in their obstinacy, they would have been commended to *Meister Hans*, the executioner. "Those who come without official position or commission," Luther wrote, "are not good enough to be called false prophets, but tramps and rogues, who should be handed over to *Meister Hans*." (Erlangen Ed., Vol. XLIII., p. 313.) What would have become of Luther if Catholic princes had acted upon this principle in his regard? At least one apostle of brutal coercion would have been silenced effectively.

*Joseph Husslein.*

---

The Incarnation has added both to nature and to human life a new dignity, since it has borne witness both to the spiritual destiny and the spiritual capacity of matter; it has exhibited the possibility, even in this world, of the union of earthly and heavenly, of human and divine.—*R. L. Ottley, D. D.*

## THE CHURCH AT WORK

### The Deaconess in City Missions

**T**HE work of a deaconess in City Missions is an unique experience and, to the present writer, after parish and institutional work, it is an experience that far transcends both. It means contact with thousands instead of tens and hundreds of people; it means a demand upon her powers of sympathy and common sense that forces growth in herself; it means an experience of being directed and used, that teaches, as nothing could in greater degree, the fact that she can do nothing of herself. Thus she realizes her servanthood anew and, in proportion to that realization, she is able to be what is needed, the representative of the friendship and the fellowship of the Church.

To illustrate we will take some incidents from hospital work. The largest hospital in Chicago has upwards of two thousand beds. There men, women, and children are registered as Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and Orthodox. The religious worker has access to the directories in the ward offices, and the Episcopal deaconess takes the names of all Protestants and goes from bed to bed to seek out her own Church people. This canvassing of the wards has to be constantly renewed, while the regular visiting of the Church people found has to be carried on at the same time, and the priest-in-charge kept regularly supplied with all current information. This canvassing of the wards is the opportunity towards the many who profess no special Church connection, from the man or woman who say that "all churches are good" and that "there is only one God anyway," to the man who frankly and intelligently disbelieves and yet cares to know more of a Christian point of view from anyone who will avoid an assumption of condescending superiority. It is impossible to enumerate all the types and grades of religion and irreligion to be met there; very many take their sickness in a perfectly simple manner as a means used by God to bring them to a greater religious seriousness, and the joy of the worker is

great to be allowed to stand by and have a glimpse of the work of the Spirit in the heart of a man or woman, to be able, perhaps, to help a little by love and encouragement as the soul feels its way towards the God Who is waiting for it.

Some of the events of the last few months stand out vividly in the writer's remembrance: the bedside baptism of a man before an operation, followed by his recovery and confirmation and the baptism and confirmation of his wife, a Jewess; the last Communion and farewell to a lonely man, to whom the deaconess came as a friend for his last months, after a careless and wandering life had left him absolutely friendless and penniless; the finding of lonely English women, who had not been able to recognize their Church under another name and who were pathetically grateful for a friend who would show them the way back, when they went out, to a renewed Church life for themselves and their children; men and women struggling with the drink habit, to whom it meant so much that some one cared when they went out again to meet temptation, some one who would be their friend even though they fell again, and who would hope for them when they could not hope for themselves; the girl who, after two years in hospital and convalescent home, had nowhere to go but a home where she would soon have broken down again under overwork, and for whom the deaconess was able to procure training in the Domestic Science School under the Sisters of St. Mary, enabling her to take her place in the world as a useful member of society instead of developing into a hopeless invalid; the Confirmation of five men in the Chapel of the Tuberculosis Hospital, of ages from 24 to 60 years, two of whom had been baptized in the hospital.

Beside her part in all such work the usefulness of the deaconess is multiplied by co-operation with the Social Service Department of the Hospital and she is able to help members of other Communions, notably the Orthodox, who have no regular visitors, by reporting cases to their churches. She can also build up interest outside, making connections with individuals in the various parishes of the city, so that she has volunteers in every direction, ready to follow up her work by calling on discharged patients and completing the connection between

them and the nearest church. It is a work that gives scope for the widest exercise of Church fellowship, that helps towards Church unity by the constant contact of people of every form of Christianity on a basis of friendly co-operation with a clear distinction of belief. Without any attempt at proselytizing there is often opportunity for a frank statement of the Church's faith and like opportunity to learn what other people do and do not believe. It is an immense mission field, returning people constantly back to their ordinary life with something gained, if only the worker is faithful and sincere. It is a life of great paradoxes; of joy in the midst of sorrow and pain, of close friendship among strangers, of comfort in weariness, of hope in discouragement, a life to which one may well bid any woman to come, who is willing to risk all for the greatest gain.

*Deaconess H. M. Fuller,  
Chicago City Mission.*

---

## Notes on the Work of a Prison Chaplain

IN the complex development of conservation and co-operation which characterizes the trend of our modern society, the prison chaplain holds a position of unusual honor and of solemn responsibility. He stands in many respects as mediator between society as a whole and those members who have had some misunderstanding with society. To him is assigned the delicate task of evaluating the social and the individual merits. His problem is to determine how the individual variant may secure his highest self-realization in normal society.

From this view the work of a chaplain in a prison is of intense interest. The expenditure of energy in the interest of men, many of whom readily acknowledge their need of help, brings a satisfaction which ministrations under other conditions often lack. The chapel services are of first consideration and therefore need to be carefully planned and rendered. From them many men get their first impressions of the Christian religion and for the first time hear the Gospel message. This knowledge brings home a strong desire for careful preparation and a sense of deep responsibility to the one who ministers.

The chapel services of appropriate hymns, lessons, responsive reading, prayers, and sermon are only the gateway to work of a very practical nature. Men soon realize that they need assistance along educational lines and seek admission to the night school. The school meets two evenings a week for one and a half hours each session, and is intended primarily for the illiterates and those of very limited education. It was found by a careful census of the prison population that, on a basis of two hundred, only three had attended college, six had reached some class in high school, about one-half of them had left school while in the fourth or fifth grade and a large number had received no systematic school training. The men apply themselves with remarkable diligence and their progress is a source of great satisfaction to themselves. It is not an uncommon thing for men who were unable to read or write when admitted to the school to be able to write letters home after less than one year's instruction. As in every group certain ones excel others, so in school those whose work is of superior quality are selected to assist others whose progress is less rapid. The benefit to the men is two-fold: they receive help and are enabled to help others, thus learning the value of co-operation, an important element in the building up of character. It is the belief of experts in penology that lack of education and the handicap which it entails is responsible for much delinquency. Therefore the school holds an important place in the routine work of the institution.

The chaplain is enabled to secure a better understanding of the individual and his life problem through private interviews. Confidence is soon established, and one finds that the man has never availed himself of the privilege of associating with men other than those of his own type and of his own environment. The majority of such men are amenable to good influence and welcome counsel and direction of which they make use, not only while confined but also after they are liberated.

Another vital factor in the work of reform is a library of well-selected books. The books are systematically distributed each Sunday and holiday, and may be changed or renewed as

in any library. It is found that thirty-six per cent of the reading is non-fiction which is above the average for public libraries in general. Magazines in large quantities are sent to the institution by people who become acquainted with the needs. By this means the men are kept in touch with the progress of the times and are given access to valuable information which was previously not within their grasp.

A well-bound Bible with large print has been placed with each man. By definite reference to it from time to time the influence of the Bible is extended. A real need has been satisfied by providing prayer cards as a guide to private devotion.

*The Prison Monitor*, a monthly magazine printed by the prison press, is of great help in many ways. While the direction of the paper is under the chaplain, most of the articles and all the mechanical work is done by the men. These efforts tend to develop originality and latent talents, very often unknown to the possessors. The magazine also forms a point of contact between the inside population and the outside people, which is proving of value to both.

The management is careful to secure the services of moral and high-minded men for the supervision of the inmates during the hours of both work and recreation. By humane and reasonable treatment there develops a spirit of co-operation which very largely eliminates infractions of the rules. Thus the institution becomes a place where new thoughts and aspirations can be encouraged.

Employment is secured for those who desire it and a hearty response is received from many corporations and individuals. The men go to their prospective employers with letters of introduction from the Superintendent of the institution. No embarrassing question have to be asked and answered, but in a self-respecting way the men find themselves reinstated in society. Their environment has been changed and with the many helps which they have received, they appreciate the new start. It is gratifying that only a very small proportion ever return. Most of them are leading industrious and upright lives and have a growing desire to "make good."

Thus the work of the prison chaplain is a work of service; service to the state and society, but particularly to an individual. The chaplain is a social physician who, by diagnosis and by prescribing remedies, uses every means at his command to give back to society the feeble member, renewed in health and vigor. His is the privilege of applying to concrete situations the ethical and social principles which have been evolved and developed from the past.

*Parker C. Manzer,  
Chaplain, Vermont State Prison.*

---

## COMMUNICATIONS

### Has German "Liberal Protestantism" Been a Contributing Cause to "Frightfulness"?

**H**AS the German "Liberal Protestant" denial of the Divinity of Jesus Christ been a contributing cause of the callousness of the German people to, and the reason for their acquiescence in, that method of making war which all the rest of the world has come to term "frightfulness?"

If it be true that Christianity is the only power which can completely change a man's nature, making a creature inherently sinful, savage and selfish into one loving, peaceful and pure; and if we find a recrudescence of savagery in a nation supposedly Christian, it is only reasonable to suppose that the increase of savagery must be due to the decline of Christianity—the only power which is able to keep savagery in check.

The fundamental proposition of Christianity is the Incarnation of the Son of God. He who was known on earth as Jesus of Nazareth, was "God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, of one substance with the Father. Who for us men and our salvation came down from Heaven and was Incarnate of the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary and was made man."—"God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds: and man, of the substance of His Mother, born in the world; perfect God and perfect man." On the other hand the

basis of the theological thought of Germany for the last eighty years has been the denial of this essential element of Christianity, and in its place has been the attempt to get back to the " Jesus of History " whose name and fame was considered to have been lost in a maze of theological dogmas. In the light of events, one book, written before the war, with no thought in the author's mind that he was committing to the future the whole damning evidence of Germany's spiritual decline, now becomes of great value and importance. It is an account drawn up with extraordinary patience and with true German methodical attention to detail, of the history of the treatment of the Life of Christ by the theological writers of the nineteenth and first decade of the twentieth century.

" The Quest of the Historical Jesus " is the English title of the first edition of the German work " From Reimarus to Wrede " by A. Schweitzer, and it is an extremely happy title and exactly descriptive of the nature of the work. The book went into a second edition in 1913 and appeared with a new title — " Geschichte der Leben = Jesu = Forschung." So far as the writer knows the additional matter of the second edition has not been translated into English.\* Schweitzer begins by stating that there are two periods in German theological thought — " Before Strauss (David Frederick Strauss 1808-1874) and after Strauss." The period before Strauss was governed by the question of miracles, the main question being the possibility of fitting them in with the philosophy of life which was presented by Kant, Hegel and their followers, and with the scientific view of the universe as being controlled by " natural law." " However," says Schweitzer, " after Strauss there was no more difficulty." No longer do we have to struggle with or worry about miracles. Strauss solved the problem for Germany when he said " the miracles are mythical additions to the gospel narratives."† Thus Strauss cleared the way for the whole future development of German Liberal Protestantism. The miracles having been successfully driven from the realm of serious

---

\* As however, this second edition is an improvement over the first the references hereafter noted are from the later work.

† P. 10 2nd Ed.

consideration there was now no difficulty in asserting authoritatively that Jesus was no longer to be considered as the God-Man, "of one substance with the Father," but a Galilean carpenter possessed with remarkable teaching powers and an unusual consciousness of the presence of God. One may sum up the turn which Strauss gave to theological thought in a few words. Jesus was simply a man, all the stories of His birth and childhood are myths, composed under the influence of messianic thought from Old Testament types. (p. 82.) All the remaining miracles and anything else that in any way smacks of the "supernatural" are to be disregarded.

The appearance of Strauss' "Leben Jesus" created a furor. Violently assailed on all sides it yet won its way. No longer were the divinity of Christ or His miracles to be disturbing elements in theological thought. They were banished to the limbo of worn out superstitions. Theology was now "illuminated." The effect of the book was two-fold. First it turned attention to the text of Holy Scripture and a far reaching development took place along this line. This has been perhaps the only field in which modern German theological scholarship has contributed anything of lasting value to Christianity. Secondly, it raised the question: If Jesus Christ was not the Son of God, where did the faith of the Christian Church originate and how did it happen to secure such universal acceptance? As one looks back, why the answer took the shape it did is easily seen. S. Paul's writings (four epistles of which were still regarded as authentic even after Baur had finished with them) dealt mainly with the teaching of Jesus as the Christ, laying stress on the Atonement and the Resurrection. Who else then but S. Paul could be the originator of this idea? Thus arose the controversy of "Jesus oder Paulus."

But it was soon seen that S. Paul could not be responsible for the whole development of Catholic Christianity and especially for the Catholic Church with its doctrines of the Trinity and of the two Natures, and so Greek thought was brought in. Hatch's Bampton lectures found their reiteration in Germany and Adolf Harnack stands before the world as one of the foremost pro-

tagonists of the havoc which Greek thought is supposed to have wrought upon the pure simple faith of the Apostles and the Early Church. It was the writer's privilege to sit almost literally at Harnack's feet in his lecture room at the University of Berlin in 1912 and the contemptuous phrase and gesture with which Dr. Harnack dismissed the Catholic dogma of the two Natures of Christ will never be forgotten.

Yet the German methodical mind was not satisfied. The " historical Jesus " had been discovered. It had been early shown that He had nothing to do with either the form or the teaching of the religion of which from earliest times He had been reputed the founder, but some uncertainty was growing up as to His own Person. The facts of His Life were not so clear as one might wish. One knew nothing about His birth, the length of the ministry was uncertain. His death was probably by crucifixion, but the fairy tales, as Strauss had called them, of the empty tomb and the Resurrection cast a shadow of doubt about the whole life. Thus the way was clear for a logical doubt. Perhaps He had never lived at all? There was so much myth in the Gospels why could it not be all myth? So Dr. Peter Jensen and Dr. Drews put forth this hypothesis. But even German professors could not stand for this. Even they could not admit the extreme logical conclusion of their thought and it was scornfully laughed down.

So another line of thought was resorted to. The Gospels are seen to be filled with what is termed " eschatology," the " last things." A great deal of Jesus' teaching was perceived to deal with a catastrophic end of the world and His second coming in the clouds of Heaven to usher in a New Era. Granting the authenticity of certain passages it was evident that He also believed Himself to be the Messiah. Where did He get this idea? Psychology is now applied. Jesus becomes a patient in the psychiatric clinic of Schweitzer and others, and the answer to the problem of the Messiah is easily found. Jesus undoubtedly was of the lineage of David. It was also a common tradition that the Messiah, when he appeared, was to be of the line of David. So the answer is easy: " Jesus believed Himself to be

the Messiah because He was the Son of David.”\* His catastrophic and other eschatological ideas can be accounted for by the influence of the Books of Daniel and Zechariah, and by the general apocalyptic thought of His time.

It remained however for an Irishman, George Bernard Shaw, to give the finishing touches to this line of thought. According to Mr. Shaw there is a great deal of Jesus’ teaching that is not only true but economically sound, and the sooner the world puts it into practice the better for the world. But he also has a fling at the eschatological question and caps the climax. It will be remembered that, according to the Gospels, in the midst of the ministry at Caesarea Philippi, it finally became evident to the disciples that their Master and Friend was different from any other whom they had ever known, and in answer to the question, “But whom say ye that I am,” Simon Peter answered and said, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God.” Mr. Shaw using this passage gives his answer in true Shavian fashion. “We should have been much less loth to say, *There is a man here who was sane until Peter hailed him as the Christ, and who then became a monomaniac.*”†

The eschatological utterances of Jesus, according to Mr. Shaw, are naught but the ravings of a madman! Strauss, Jensen, Shaw! The first and the last! The attempt of Strauss to depict a purely human Jesus, not the Christ, finds its logical ending either in the conclusion of Jensen that he never lived or in that of Shaw that He was insane!

But let us turn to a happier line of thought. A book which may be classed with the *Confessions* of St. Augustine, or the *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, is “*A Spiritual Pilgrimage*” by the Rev. R. J. Campbell, the former world-famous pastor of the City Temple, London, recently ordained in the Church of England. A serious student of German theology and once imbued with its alluring tenets, he was for a time the foremost upholder of “Liberal Protestantism.” It was the “Christus myth” which

---

\* P. 395.

† Preface to *Androcles and the Lion*, p. xlv.

drove him to reconsider his position. If the logical conclusion was that there was no Jesus, there must be something wrong with the premise. For the fact of Jesus was to him undeniable. And so he began his studies anew. Let us hear his own words. " It was the Christ of the Catholic Church that stood forth from the newer criticism of the Gospel sources, not the Christ of ' Liberal Protestantism.' This was forcibly thrust upon my attention. The alternatives were obvious: either Jesus was what the Catholic Church said He was or He did not exist; either He was the man from Heaven, a complete break with the natural order of things, the representative of a transcendental order, supernatural, super-rational, super-everything, or He was nothing." (P. 224.)

The nails in the statue of Von Hindenburg represent the German failure to perceive that the Jesus nailed to the Cross was the God-Man. The sinking of the *Lusitania*, the Zeppelin raids, vessels torpedoed without warning, are the answer to the question " Shall I crucify your King " as the mob cries out " We have no King but the Kaiser." Jesus said " When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house from which I came out, and when he cometh he findeth it swept and garnished. Then goeth he and taketh to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and they enter in and dwell there and the last state of that man is worse than the first."

Is it possible that the unclean spirit is the old Teutonic pagan religion, with its worship and legends of Odin, Thor and Wotan? Driven out by the conversion of Germany to Christianity, has it returned to the place whence it came out? Are we witnessing the true " Götterdämmerung? " Is this spectacle of frightfulness the entering of the Gods into Walhalla? Have the German theologians and Richard Wagner been the unconscious authors of the worst phases of the Great War?

One great lesson of this war which it is hoped will not be lost (and indeed there are many evident signs that it is not being lost) is that only as a nation becomes really Christian, and places itself more and more under the spiritual power of Jesus

Christ as Leader, Saviour and Redeemer will a lasting peace be brought about. A nation is not above the level of the people who compose it, and it is only when every individual heart in the nation is ruled by Jesus Christ as Incarnate God that there will come the time when wars shall be no more and God's will be done on earth as it is in Heaven. Jesus Christ came "to preach peace to them that are far off and to them that are nigh," as the great Saviour of the race. Only when He and His message become ruling factors in life will His day dawn.

*Edwin Selden Lane.*

---

"The Holy Ghost is our Teacher in all that we are required to know for the right ordering of life in the sacred way. The authoritative teaching of the Church is none other than His own, for He abides in the Church. Through the Church He declares what is of faith. The Catholic Creeds are recognized as His declaration through the Ecumenical Councils. The Holy Scriptures are given by His inspiration, and He has committed them to the guardianship of the Church, through which He interprets them for the instruction and guidance of the faithful. The Holy Ghost further teaches us through the conscience which in every one is the faculty of spiritual discernment. Howsoever we receive Divine truth, whether through the Church, or through the conscience, we receive it from the Holy Ghost."

*Jesse Brett.*

---

"By faith we do not mean a belief or opinion held as true by the mind only; we mean a certain practical attitude by which we look to or trust something as an effective power or help in our life. Thus, in small matters we put our faith in anything which will serve as a tool for some purpose of our own; but, in the highest sense, our very being in the purposes of life itself, we can trust only to that which is altogether above us by a self-surrender which is worship."

*Herbert Kelley.*

# The American Church Monthly

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

93 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

*President:* GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

*Vice President:* GUY VAN AMRINGE, 31 Nassau Street, New York

*Secretary:* THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 4 Chelsea Square, New York

*Treasurer:* HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

*Business Manager:* The Rev. WILLIAM H. A. HALL, 93 Nassau Street, New York

---

EDITORIAL COUNCIL: Charles S. Baldwin, Ph.D., *Professor of Rhetoric, Columbia University*; the Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D., *Rector of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York*; the Rev. Charles C. Edmunds, D.D., *Professor of New Testament Literature, General Theological Seminary*; the Rev. Hughell E. W. Fosbrooke, D.D., *Dean of the General Theological Seminary*; the Rev. Francis J. Hall, D.D., *Professor of Dogmatic Theology, General Theological Seminary*; the Rev. Arthur W. Jenks, D.D., *Professor of Ecclesiastical History, General Theological Seminary*; the Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., *Rector of Trinity Church, New York*; the Rev. John Mockridge, D.D., *Rector of St. James Church, Philadelphia*; the Rev. Ralph B. Pomeroy, B.D., *Rector of Trinity Church, Princeton, N. J.*; Chandler R. Post, Ph.D., *Assistant Professor of Greek and of Fine Arts, Harvard University*; Robert K. Root, Ph.D., *Professor of English, Princeton University*; the Rev. Hamilton Schuyler, *Rector Trinity Church, Trenton, N. J.*; Chauncey B. Tinker, Ph.D., *Professor of English Literature, Yale University*; the Rev. Lucius Waterman, D.D., *Rector of St. Thomas Church, Hanover, N. H.*

Two Dollars a Year

Twenty cents a Copy

Canadian subscription, \$2.25 a Year

Foreign subscription, \$2.50 a Year

---

Volume I

AUGUST, 1917

Number 6

---

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS

IT is a little late but not, we hope, too late to note the changes in the editorial staff of *The Churchman*. The position of editor-in-chief has been accepted by the Reverend William Austin Smith, D.D., who has had wide parochial experience in eastern and western cures, Miss Margaret Jeffreys Hobart is to act as associate editor, in charge of the department of Women's Work, and the Reverend Guy Emery Shipler will also be an associate editor in charge of the department of Social Welfare.

A new staff of workers is sure to bring fresh energy and initiative to the development of the weekly periodical so long established and with such old traditions. The AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY feels, however, not quite so juvenile now that its editorial board is no longer the very latest among those venturing into the field of church periodical literature.

THE discussions on both sides of the Atlantic in our Communion relating to Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament are not, when careful heed is given to the literature called forth, of the nature of a controversy whether or not Reservation is a legitimate practice of the Church, so much as a consideration of the disciplinary side of the practice, i. e., when and where and with what attendant circumstances Reservation is to take place. Of course a certain number opposed to any and all things distinctively catholic will always inveigh against almost any emphasis upon the different aspects of the Sacrament of the Altar excepting that of a commemorative rite. But that opposition is nothing new. Our Book of Common Prayer teaches and enjoins reverence and decency and employs language anciently and continuously found in the liturgy of the Church expressing the dignity and ineffable worth of this ordinance. Thus we have the expressions — “blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ” — in the Form of Consecration of a Church or Chapel; “most blessed Body and Blood” and “precious Body and Blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord” in the Prayer of Consecration; and the injunction that the “consecrated Elements” be treated “reverently,” in the rubric following the communion of the people. Again, the Gloria in Excelsis as an act of adoration is provided for use before the Blessing, or some other hymn substituted. We may hold with abundant evidence that the truth of the Real Presence under the Forms of Bread and Wine — a Presence undefined among us, because undefinable, is not an open question.

Neither is there any doubt of the existence of the practice of Reservation from very early days for the communion of the people outside the public service, both the well and the ill, the able-bodied, e. g., travelers, and the infirm. The accumulation of instances in illustration from history and from individual experience grows stronger as such instances are sought for. Reservation for communion under extraordinary conditions is not questionable historically. Such was the admission by the

two English Archbishops some years ago, who nevertheless were unwilling to concede that the disciplinary provisions of the English Prayer Book directly permitted Reservation. We need not be disturbed as though any subject was being re-opened. Regulation, not actual use of the practice, is the point around which discussion revolves just now. There are many other practices of the Church which need regulation, e. g., the wine used in the Holy Eucharist; the method of preparing the bread to be used, whether the bread may be steeped in wine and then baked, consecrated and administered under one kind; preparation for Confirmation, and explicit assent to the Creeds for ordinands, amongst others. In none of these is the proper practice really in doubt but there is great need of regulation. It is much to be desired that Bishops should proceed at once to the regulation of such matters.

---

THE centre of the discussion at present proceeding is concerning the place where the Reserved Sacrament is to be kept, if continuously reserved; how it is to be treated and whether free access for purposes of devotion is permissible or to be permitted. Two different attitudes are taken on these points by two English Bishops who may be taken as representatives, the Bishop of London and the Bishop of Oxford. Both may be assumed to desire for the faithful in general all that the Church has to grant from its treasures of grace. The Bishop of London is in close and sympathetic touch with many hearts, of rich and poor, educated and unlettered, men and women. They are reaching out eagerly in the midst of sorrow, bereavement, anxiety and pain, the common woes of mankind and the special distresses of the present war, towards our Lord in His Church in any and every way whereby He is a God nigh at hand. A keen theologian of the English Church has said that Anglo-Saxons are temperamentally instinctively afraid of whatever tends to bring the Kingdom of heaven too near. Now the Chief Pastor of the metropolitan diocese of London, strong

in his pastoral relations and responsibilities always, feels this barrier being broken down and he longs to see the full tide of love for the Saviour and of flying to Him for comfort and prayer flowing unimpeded in every channel that leads near to Him. He recognizes a critical moment in English religious life. There is a turning to Christ from every side, there is a wonderful increase of communions and of the sacramental life. There is a demand not to be fettered by restrictions which arose from conditions that have passed away. Bishop Ingram doubtless is aware of dangers but he foresees great gain. He knows how the devotional life of other races has flowed strong and clear in the midst of free access to the Sacrament reserved at the Altar primarily for extra-liturgical communion. He means to control and direct this yearning and reaching out of the heart of his people.

On the other hand the Bishop of Oxford, with a full sense of his responsibilities as defender of his flock from false doctrine and staunch upholder of the Church as teacher and guide and wise Mother (would that all Bishops recognized thus the episcopal responsibility), starts from the theological and academic standpoint. With the painstaking care of the scholar and thinker he proceeds to consider afresh the teaching and theology of the Church as to the Incarnation and its extension in the Sacrament of the Altar. Definitions and their danger, metaphysical difficulties, the history of the devotional uses of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ in the English Church and other national churches, the dangers of being compromised by erroneous or unauthoritative doctrinal forms — all of these are before him. He is determined to proceed with caution and reserve. Better to make no mistakes than to fall into error, suffer therefrom and have to recover painfully. So Bishop Gore deprecates the permissive free and unrestricted approach to the Sacrament in tabernacle, pyx or other place of reservation, and the assembling of special groups of people for special devotions in the immediate vicinity.

THE Church may be the gainer by the approach to this important matter from both directions because the wrong may emphasize the right position. In fact the attitude of the type of diocesan represented by the Bishop of London (for there are other and equally beloved Bishops who are at one with him) includes such regulation as is calculated to safeguard against abuse while not interfering with full use of the Reserved Sacrament. But those who approach the subject in the method employed by the Bishop of Oxford seem to interpret regulation as meaning diocesan permission or prohibition to do this or that, e. g. to reserve the Consecrated Elements for the communion of the sick continuously, to reserve in a known and accessible part of the Church, to indicate and appreciate that place of reservation by acts of adoration or practices of prayer. Here the theological and academic get the better of the witness of the Church and allow the pastoral cure of souls to fall into the background. The issue is missed or avoided that what is the proper use of a sacrament or other ordinance of the Church anywhere is a proper use in any and every part of the Church whether actually so used everywhere or not. If Reservation is a proper use of the Sacrament of the Altar in London it is a proper use in any and every diocese, not merely because the diocesan allows it. The principle is incontrovertible and should be examined widely to see how generally it is applied in practice.

The outcome of the approach to the discussion of the method of dealing with and using the Reserved Sacrament purely from the theological standpoint, and the attempts to *explain* the Real Presence in order to avoid difficulties which appear because, like the Incarnation and its cardinal events, the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection, it is beyond human experience, inevitably result in positions, to say the least, unbalanced. To quote the Bishop of Oxford against himself in his recent book—*The Religion of the Church*—"We cannot analyse the mystery." The term, "extra-liturgical", is being over-worked and the meaning of *unwarrantable* read into it which it does not

connote. A sermon, apart from the Communion Service, is extra-liturgical, so are Offerings and Offertory Sentences and the Blessing, if used apart from the Liturgy, i. e. the Communion Office. Many devotions have an extra-liturgical propriety which is entirely legitimate. Where rubrical permission is now given, the use of them, e. g. the Offertory Sentences, had become habitual and traditional long before the rubric was framed. The extra-liturgical use or uses of the Sacrament of the Altar are ancient, historical, and universal, and founded very solidly and with a full exercise of childlike, loving faith upon the truth of the Incarnation and its extension in Holy Eucharist.

---

A THIRD method of approach to the matter at issue concerning the Reserved Sacrament is illustrated by the studies on the subject set forth by Dr. Darwell Stone. Like the other names mentioned by us he is one, albeit ranking very high, amongst a number of loyal and scholarly students and clergy who are earnestly desirous that our Communion shall recover explicitly all its heritage. His examination\* of the evidence and his fair-minded conclusions have placed the material for studying the subject at the command of those who wish just such a collection of evidence for their consideration. Accurate and accomplished scholar as Dr. Stone is, he is ready to give full value to the instinctive reaching out of the heart of the Church towards the Heart of Jesus and to admit that the intuition of devout faith may and does span the gulf between theology and Revelation.

“ I know that Thou art here, I know not how,  
While others argue, I Thy Word adore  
Body and soul before Thee lowly bow  
Thy Word hath spoken it, I ask no more.

---

\* The Reserved Sacrament. Darwell Stone, *Young Churchman Co.* Episcopal Authority and Reservation. Dr. Darwell Stone. Letter in the *Church Times*, March 9, 1917.

AS we follow the discussion on which we have been commenting, we are forcibly reminded of two incidents in the history of the Church, one in the first century, the other in the nineteenth.

Two Apostles had been boldly teaching and practicing the truth that Jesus is the Messiah and is God. The Jewish council disapproved and desired to put down this teaching. That is the attitude of the unbelieving world. The learned and statesmanlike Gamaliel proposes a test. "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught. But if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it." It may be regulated, if true doctrine, in practice. It cannot, if true, be destroyed.

In the latter half of the last century a Bishop of London heard Dean Stanley report on the services at S. Alban's, Holborn. The astute Dean, when asked what he had seen, replied, "I saw three men in green, my Lord, and your lordship will find it very difficult to put them down." They have not been put down.

---

Through a fault of the mail, several errors occur in an article by the Rev. Henry C. Staunton, in the July issue of the *Monthly*. The title of the article should have been "The Norm of Ceremonial," instead of "The Form of Ceremonial." And on page 21 the author is made to say that "the Roman custom is to wear a stole for the choir offices," although he wrote, "the Roman custom is to wear no stole for the choir offices."

We send proofs of their articles to all of our writers, and assume that their reading, with that of the editors, will eliminate errors. In the case of this article, we did not receive the author's corrected proof, although he mailed it to us.

Bishop Hall calls our attention to a slight but important error in his review of Sir Oliver Lodge's book, "Raymond," on page 72 of the same issue. He corrected Mr. Holt's name from Harry to Henry. The failure to make this correction in type must be assumed by this office, an admission which we make with regret and apology both to Bishop Hall and to our readers.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Primitive Worship and the Prayer Book.* Rationale, History, and Doctrine of the English, Irish, Scottish, and American Books. By the Reverend Walker Gwynne, D.D.; pp. xxvi-424; price, \$2.50 net; Longmans, Green & Company, 1917.

Of the Reverend Dr. Gwynne's treatise on the Book of Common Prayer, it cannot be said, *ab uno disce omnes*. In other words, the character of the whole book cannot be estimated by an examination of any single paragraph or page therein. Much of what is set forth is such as we might expect from the scholarly pen of the author, but the value of the teaching varies greatly. In some instances, at least, the doctrine is not Prayer Book doctrine but the author's personal opinion. The title, *Primitive Worship and The Prayer Book*, evidently implies agreement; but it may be questioned how far Dr. Gwynne's exposition of "our incomparable liturgy" expresses the religious principles of primitive Christians. Christians of the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages believed it to be obligatory upon them, as well as a joy and a privilege, to attend the celebration of the Divine Mysteries of the Eucharist on the Lord's day; and they did so at the risk, and often at the cost, of their life; they believed it necessary to do penance for their sins, and to submit to the penitential discipline of the Church. We do not find such principles explicitly set forth by Dr. Gwynne.

The annotations on the legal title of "this Church" (p. 125-129) are excellent. The statements concerning the quality and character of the bread and wine (p. 160) which must be used in order to make a valid Eucharist, are true and timely. Would that the author had used his opportunity to point out, first, the lawlessness of a custom which has recently been introduced among us, viz., the use of a baked mixture of flour-dough and wine as the sole matter for consecration; and, secondly, the invalidity of such matter. In calling attention to an inaccuracy in the phraseology of our Proper Preface for Trinity Sunday (p. 14), Dr. Gwynne has rendered service which we hope may be efficient in the cause of truth. It is remarkable that the Commission on the Revision of the Prayer Book, after recommending that the opening sentence should read, "Who with thine only-begotten Son, and with the Holy Spirit, art one God," thereby restoring to us, in the said Preface, an explicit recognition of the obligation to offer the holy Sacrifice to God the Father, omitted to recommend a change in the final

clause such as would do away with the theological inaccuracy of the words "without any difference."

Dr. Gwynne, in his brief note thereon (p. 213) deals wisely and reverently with the question of the use of the "Imprecatory Psalms." People need instruction concerning the true significance of such imprecations, and to be reminded of the fact that "God's hatred and punishment of sin is expressed by the merciful lips of our Lord and Judge Himself, in language stronger and more terrible than any Psalmist ever used."

The comment on "Transubstantiation" (p. 185) is rather that of a partisan than the well-balanced judgment of a theologian. The author seems to have forgotten that the Tridentine statement, while it affirms the conversion of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, does not attempt to explain *how* the said conversion takes place. Roman theologians point out that the said *conversion* is not, strictly speaking, mutation or change. The teaching of Gelasius (quoted by Dr. Gwynne) is the teaching of Roman theologians at this day. "Within the sphere of natural phenomena and effects," Cardinal Manning declares, "there is no change in the consecrated elements. Everything that is an object of sensation or perception remains unaltered. That which the eye sees or the palate tastes, the colour, the extension, the weight, the sapidity, the powers of nutrition, etc., continue to exist in all their original reality and identity." Our Article of Religion (xxviii) does not deny that which the Council of Trent affirms, but the doctrine which was popular in the mediaeval period and which denied any real objective existence to the outward signs of bread and wine after consecration. Dr. Pusey, referring to the Tridentine definition says, "no words could express more exactly the faith or those who believe in the real presence."

Dr. Gwynne advocates (p. 145) consecration of the Eucharist on Good Friday. With the exception of the Reverend John Henry Blunt, the authorities to whom he refers do not altogether favour his contention. Dr. Liddon, while he allows that such action (in his opinion) may not be disloyal to the doctrine of the Church of England, declares that, "We cannot say that when a Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, are appointed, a celebration is obligatory;" and of his personal practice he says, "I myself have never communicated on Good Friday for more than thirty years." The reference to Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica* "to explain how the omission of Consecration grew up," is not pertinent. Scudamore discusses, not the cessation of consecration on Good

Friday, but the origin and course of the practice of reserving the Eucharist in the Maundy Thursday mass for Communion on Good Friday. Except in some quarters within the "Anglican Communion" since the middle of the sixteenth century, Good Friday has always and everywhere been regarded as a non-liturgical day. Mgr. Duchesne tells us that, "On Good Friday there was no liturgical celebration of the Eucharist anywhere."

Dr. Gwynne admits the lawfulness among us "of voluntary confession to a priest in a case of necessity." We wonder what is his idea of "a case of necessity." He deprecates habitual confession. It looks as if, in Dr. Gwynne's judgment, the use of the sacrament of Penance might be tolerated in the case of a penitent who had been exceedingly sinful, but should be regarded as needless for respectable and self-respecting Christians outside of the Church of Rome. Anent "teaching confession in the Church of England," Dr. Liddon says, "If men preach <sup>1</sup>) the reality of absolution through the application of the Blood of Jesus Christ to the soul; <sup>2</sup>) the liberty of coming to confession granted by the Church of England; <sup>3</sup>) the nature of sin, which can never leave an instructed and sensitive conscience at peace until there is an assurance of forgiveness; it is all we want." Of the fast before Communion Dr. Gwynne is not more tolerant than he is of the sacrament of Penance. Refutation of his arguments in each case is, as it were, a slaying of the slain. Father Puller tells us that in the opinion of Saint Augustine "the institution of the strict fast before Communion was due to the Apostle Saint Paul." He (Saint Augustine) "lays down the principle that 'Whatever the Universal Church holds, if it was not instituted by Councils, but has always been retained, is most rightfully believed to have been delivered by nothing less than apostolical authority.' Bishop Beveridge calls this *dictum* of Saint Augustine 'a golden rule.' . . . It was just because the Ecumenical rule of fasting Communion had not been instituted by Councils that Saint Augustine ascribed its origin to the authority of the Apostles; and as the Apostles were directly commissioned by our Lord, and were inspired by the Holy Ghost, therefore Saint Augustine does not shrink from ascribing in some sense the authorship of the rule of fasting Communion to our Lord and to the Holy Ghost."

We notice an erroneous statement (p. 315) in regard to the laying on of the hand of the Bishop when administering Confirmation, viz., that "in the mediaeval Church of England, as in the Roman Church today, the Bishop was accustomed to touch only the cheek of the candidate."

Before quoting Professor Shairp's jocular remark about the presbytery of Argyll (note, p. 381), Dr. Gwynne should have bethought himself of the fact that there never were "360 crosses" on the isle of Iona.

C. P. A. BURNETT.

*The Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels.* By Thomas James Thorburn, D.D., LL.D. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons. Pp. xxi-356. \$1.50 net.

Some forty years ago an eminent critic described a picture exhibited by an eminent artist as "a pot of paint thrown in the face of the public." There has sprung up of late years a curious form of historical(?) study which may be fairly enough described as "a pot of printer's ink thrown in the face of the public," and this book of an English writer, who has carried off one of the Bross Prizes offered in Lake Forest University, Illinois, is an attempt to show how worthless this so-called "Mythical Interpretation" of the Gospels is. Some of our readers will be happily ignorant of this subject. It may be well to say, therefore, that a French writer, Dupuis, about a century and a quarter ago, threw out a suggestion that Jesus Christ was not a real historical figure, and in fact, that no such person ever existed. This bold suggestion fell flat enough in its own day, but it has been revived in the last fifty years by some fanciful persons. It takes two main lines, one making out the Gospel story to be a myth representing in terms of a great Light-giver, who has a public ministry one year long,\* the passage of the sun through the signs of the zodiac, and the other making the same story to be a myth representing the annual birth and death of the world's vegetation. The plan of the book before us is that of taking up the leading events of our Lord's life in order, first showing what the expounders of the myth-theory make out of the story in hand, and then criticizing the mythical explanation. For example, students of ancient myths find two stars in the constellation Cancer, which were called by some old-time observer "the two asses," and there is a story of Bacchus, who is certainly mythical, and a vegetation god, finding a difficulty in crossing a marshy tract, until he caught two asses, and rode on one of them. This, say some of our new teachers, is enough to show that the narration of our Lord's triumphal entry into Jerusalem cannot be

---

\* The view that our Lord's public ministry lasted only one year, a view probably founded on a misunderstanding of Is. lxi:2 as quoted in St. Luke iv:19, and quite irreconcilable with the Gospel according to St. John, is one of the chief pillars of the myth-theory.

genuine history, it *must* be simply a zodiacal myth. It is pointed out, on the other hand, that our Lord's entry into Jerusalem is connected by the Evangelists with the Jewish Passover, which belongs to late March or early April, and that in those days the sun did not enter the sign of Cancer till late June. The alleged correspondence does not correspond.

Now, if any reader wishes to have at hand as a reference-book — this is distinctly a book for reference, rather than a book for reading — something which will catalogue for him the follies of "Mythical Interpretation," and help him with shrewd comments, pointing out the absurdities of argument and the blunders of statement by which such interpretations is backed up, the book we have under review may be recommended him. To be sure, Dr. Thorburn is not an exact scholar. He speaks (p. 33, note) of Pope Julius as fixing the time for celebrating the feast of the Nativity as Dec. 25, in the year 354. This was two years after the death of Julius, and we think that there is no respectable authority for connecting the name of Julius with any such determination at all. Again, our author finds occasion to quote a letter addressed to him by a distinguished astronomer on two pages of his book (xiv and 110), and he represents him on one page as faulting Dupuis for being "ten or eleven thousand years wrong" about something, and on another page as calling him "between twelve and thirteen thousand years wrong." It does not make much difference. When the myth students get their calculations about the zodiac ten thousand years out of the way, two or three thousand more are a bagatelle. But we have to acknowledge that our champions against these dreamers cannot be defended upon scholarly accuracy. When we take his arm, we must walk warily. Having said this, we are bound to add that his infrequent slips do not affect his main argument, which is just and true.

It does need to be said, however, that if any of us encounter persons who have been carried away by one of the expositions of "Mythical Interpretation" \* which Dr. Thorburn has here pilloried for us, we shall need to use a different method from that of Dr. Thorburn's book. To

---

\* It may not be amiss to call attention here to the deep difference between two phrases of similar sound. "*Mystical* Interpretation," which is one of the treasures of the Catholic Church, is a method of studying Holy Scripture which recognizes and respects the literal meaning of Old Testament stories, but finds in them higher and divine meanings, even as St. Paul saw in the story of the first man, Adam, a type of our Lord communicating life from His body to a whole new race of men. "*Mythical* Interpretation," on the other hand, is a deadly foe of Christ's Gospel, trying to persuade us that the fundamental facts of our faith are not facts, and that the Gospel stories are not literally true at all.

have this book in hand may be of much help to us in answering particular suggestions made by our opponents, but we must not allow ourselves to be kept answering their points. That would be allowing the enemy to choose his own ground on which to give us battle. We need to choose our own ground, and attack, rather than defend. Perhaps the very first thing to do for persons whose minds are entangled with "mythical" suggestions is to show them that a multitude of curious coincidences do not necessarily prove anything at all. If we can persuade such a person to read Archbishop Whately's "Historic Doubts Relative to Napoleon Bonaparte," in which it is clearly shown that his story is a myth, and that the name of Napoleon is an allegoric title signifying "Godless Revolution," we may prepare the way for a really reasonable scepticism. Then we need to follow up this preparation by a two-fold attack on the mythical position, pointing out first that all the four Evangelists show plainly that they are writing about a real man, who had won their personal devotion, and of whom they present a recognizable picture, and that St. Paul also writes as the devoted follower of a Master of whom he had personal knowledge. Then, if the laws of mythical interpretation still insist that to their minds it is plain that the writers of the four Gospels were all writing allegory, and never thought of themselves as writing the story of a real man, who suffered under Pontius Pilate, it will be time to bring up our second line of attack. The myth-theory is obliged to assume that the founders of the Christian religion were persons wholly absorbed in two great interests, sun-worship and (in close connection therewith) the worship of the mystery of life renewed, as it appears in the annual returns of seed-time and harvest. But let us look at the facts of the case. The early Christian writers do not show themselves at all interested in either of these subjects. It is a supposition contrary to fact. Even within the range of the New Testament itself the writers of the Epistles do not show any concern for either of these matters, on which the Gospels are supposed to be dwelling constantly. St. Paul, to be sure, speaks of our Lord as "the first-fruits" of a great harvest—"the first-fruits of them that are asleep"—but he does not represent our Lord's resurrection as an allegory of the earth's wheat-harvest, but rather points to the earth's wheat-harvest as an allegory of something done by the Lord Jesus on a much higher level. We are asked to consider whether the Gospel stories are genuine history or mere myth, and it is suggested to us by our opponents that the early disciples were divided into two classes, those who were taught the stories as literal narratives, and those who were initiated into

the mysteries, and there taught that the stories were purely mythical. According to that theory, then, the more advanced disciples of this religion, the deeper students who alone knew what the religion really meant, were utterly unable to hand on their religion as a continuing force, and the ignorant and deluded disciples, the learners who never really learned anything at all, succeeded in imposing a mere fancy upon the world, persuaded a large part of the world to follow passionately the supposed leading of a man who never had a real existence, and by the teaching of this blunder raised the world to new levels of thought and feeling and life, and laid successfully the foundations of all modern progress. That is not at all a rational way of accounting for the unquestionable facts of Christian history. The myth-theory stands self-condemned. When that is clear to us, we do not feel obliged to examine its wild guesses in detail.

L. W.

*Spiritual Sacrifice: The Moorhouse Lectures for 1915.* By John Stephen Hart, M.A., B.Sc., Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne; Warden of St. John's Theological College. Longmans, Green & Co., Crown 8vo. 1916. Price, \$1.50 net.

These lectures from far off Australia are noteworthy for the modesty, originality and freshness of treatment of their subject matter. Although a trite saying, it is nevertheless very true of them that they will provoke and stimulate thoughtful consideration upon the part of an attentive reader. Reverence, high spiritual aspiration, as well as a frankness and boldness of attack, run through the entire discussion. No one who studies the subject of the Eucharist from the point of view of doctrinal statement can afford to pass them by. Likewise he who would endeavour to work out a synthesis in the practical field of liturgical discipline will find in them much to interest and enlighten him. Moreover this is all true whether you agree with Mr. Hart's postulates and conclusions or not. Even though he may seem to traverse views upon the subjects which many hold very tenaciously, they cannot safely ignore the matter and plan of these lectures.

The titles of some of them, as for example, I. "The Worshipful God," III. "The Sacrifice of God," V. "Worship in Christ," VII. "The Art of Worship," indicate not only the wide range of the method of discussion, but also the inner shrine into which he reverently and thoughtfully gazes.

The author's treatment of the Atonement in chapters III. (already noted) and IV., "Some Theories of Atonement," will probably not

commend itself to the conservative theologian. At the same time it is of interest especially in its relation to the whole subject of the series taken as a single theme.

Chapter VI. "Eucharist and Mass," contrasts two modes of understanding the rationale of Eucharistic Worship, i. e., from the points of view of historical and liturgical development and of scholastic formulation. It will suggest many things often overlooked by the average parson, and that whether he likes Mr. Hart's method or not. For even although Mr. Hart's conclusions, and suggestions regarding practice, may come as a shock, calling as they do for re-statement of doctrinal formulae and for revision of liturgical forms and ceremonies, every one who reads his lectures will be set to thinking—a most necessary thing in these days of superficial acceptance, only too often, of shibboleths, to the detriment of truth.

Read these lectures over critically and sympathetically, analyze their arguments and then thrash the whole subject over in your own mind, and whatever be your conclusions as to the points at issue, you will be helped to clarity of both thought and expression, in your concept of Christian Worship as enshrined in the Holy Eucharist, and its possibilities.

Perhaps the best use of these lectures would be to make them the subject of a series of discussions in some clerical club or society, as for example, in the reading circles of the Central Society of Sacred Study. Thus to do would stimulate wider reading upon the part of many of their members, and some pretty close thinking likewise—two things that would do them no harm.

H. R. G.

*"After This Manner Pray Ye."* Studies in the Lord's Prayer. By A. H. McNeile, D.D. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1916. 50 cents net.

This is a companion volume of "Self-Training in Prayer" by the same author. Dr. McNeile has, one might say, the genius of putting into small books great thoughts, suggestive and inspiring in their character. This volume should be read as a sequel to the first, because the Lord's Prayer is the model and pattern of all prayer; from it a Christian can and should draw inspiration for his own prayers. While this book is written in simple language, so that even he that runs may understand, yet the thoughts repay the most careful meditation. Into the making of this book has gone real spiritual power and real spiritual knowledge. In the

pulpit much is said about praying, but we venture to say that most of our congregations are untrained in prayer; they do not know how to pray beyond the repetition of formal prayers. It would be a good thing if, into the hands of our people, we could put this book with the author's other, "Self-Training in Prayer," and Dr. Fosdick's "The Meaning of Prayer." Then we might have a really praying church.

*The Expository Value of the Revised Version*, by George Milligan, D.D. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1917.

All readers of our English New Testament and many of those who have some acquaintance with the original Greek will find this little book both interesting and helpful. It is one of a "Short Course Series," intended to aid preachers and teachers in giving short courses of expository lectures. Dr. Milligan tells briefly and clearly the story of the successive English translations, and then proceeds to show by abundant examples how the Revised Version, by its accuracy and close faithfulness to the original removes difficulties, illumines obscurities and adds significance to unnoticed passages. The volume is dedicated to James Hope Moulton, who did so much for New Testament scholarship and who lately perished in a submarine attack.

C. C. E.

*American Addresses 1916*. By Huyshe, Lord Bishop of Worcester. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1917. 50 cents net.

Bishop Yeatman-Biggs of Worcester, who with Bishop Montgomery carried the greetings of the Church of England to the Episcopal Church of America assembled in the late General Convention, is no stranger to our readers, and many deputies and others, who had the pleasure of meeting the Bishop or hearing him, will be glad to have in print a few of his utterances during his brief visit to this country. The addresses and the sermons selected are uniformly dignified, friendly and helpful, not the less so for some repetition of ideas and phrases made to widely separated audiences. The last chapter gives us an interesting account of the speeches made at a luncheon given to the Bishop by the Pilgrims, the Bishop's reply to Mr. Chauncey Depew, presiding officer, being a model of postprandial mingled humor and seriousness. Mr. Depew's statement, in his reported speech, that Dr. William Smith was consecrated together with Samuel Seabury, was, of course, a mistake.

W. H. B.